DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER LIBRARY

AUDIOVISUAL DEPARTMENT

1955 ADDRESSES OF PRESIDENT DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

The text to most of the public messages and statements of the President of the United States that were released by the White House during the Eisenhower Administration, January 20, 1953 through January 20, 1961, may be found in the eight volumes, *Public Papers of the Presidents: Dwight D. Eisenhower 1953-61*. The items in these volumes are presented in Chronological order, rather than being grouped in classes. Most needs for a classified arrangement are met by the subject index volume, *The Cumulated Indexes to the Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Eisenhower.*

In the following listing of public messages and statements of President Eisenhower available as sound recordings from the Dwight D. Eisenhower Presidential Library, the number enclosed in parens, preceding the title, represents the identification given the message or statement as recorded in the List of Items of each volume. Written transcript not available for those titles preceded by an asterisk.

Remarks or addresses were delivered in Washington, D.C., unless otherwise indicated.

1955

(4) Annual Message to the Congress on the State of the Union January 6, 1955

EL-Dl6-50 (RA) part 1

[Delivered in person before a joint session]

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Congress:

First, I extend cordial greetings to the 84th Congress. We shall have much to do together; I am sure that we shall get it done and, that we shall do it in harmony and good will. At the outset, I believe it would be well to remind ourselves of this great fundamental in our national life: our common belief that every human being is divinely endowed with dignity and worth and inalienable rights. This faith, with its corollary that to grow and flourish people must be free shapes the interests and aspirations of every American. From this deep faith have evolved three main purposes of our Federal Government:

First, to maintain justice and freedom among ourselves and to champion them for others so that we may work effectively for enduring peace; Second, to help keep our economy vigorous and expanding, thus sustaining our international strength and assuring better jobs, better living, better opportunities for every citizen; And third, to concern ourselves with the human problems of our people so that every American may have the opportunity to lead a healthy, productive and rewarding life. Foremost among these broad purposes of government is our support of freedom, justice and peace.

It is of the utmost importance, that each of us understands the true nature of the struggle now taking place in the world. It is not a struggle merely of economic theories, or of forms of government, or of military power. At issue is the true nature of man. Either man is the creature whom the Psalmist described as "a little lower than the angels," crowned with glory and honor, holding "dominion over the works" of his Creator; or man is a soulless, animated machine to be enslaved, used and consumed by the state for its own glorification.

It is, therefore, a struggle which goes to the roots of the human spirit, and its shadow falls across the long sweep of man's destiny. This prize, so precious, so fraught with ultimate meaning, is the true object of the contending forces in the world. In the past year, there has been progress justifying hope, both for continuing peace and for the ultimate rule of freedom and justice in the world. Free nations are collectively stronger than at any time in recent years. Just as nations of this Hemisphere, in the historic Caracas and Rio conferences, have closed ranks against imperialistic Communism and strengthened their economic ties, so free nations elsewhere have forged new bonds of unity.

Recent agreements between Turkey and Pakistan have laid a foundation for increased strength in the Middle East. With our understanding support, Egypt and Britain, Yugoslavia and Italy, Britain and Iran have resolved dangerous differences. The security of the Mediterranean has been enhanced by an alliance among Greece, Turkey and Yugoslavia. Agreements in Western Europe have paved the way for unity to replace past divisions which have undermined Europe's economic and military vitality. The defense of the West appears likely at last to include a free, democratic Germany participating as an equal in the councils of NATO.

In Asia and the Pacific, the pending Manila Pact supplements our treaties with Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Korea and Japan and our prospective treaty with the Republic of China. These pacts stand as solemn warning that future military aggression and subversion against the free nations of Asia will meet united response. The Pacific Charter, also adopted at Manila, is a milestone in the development of human freedom and self-government in the Pacific area. Under the auspices of the United Nations, there is promise of progress in our country's plan for the peaceful use of atomic energy.

Finally, today the world is at peace. It is, to be sure, a secure peace. Yet all humanity finds hope in the simple fact that for an appreciable time there has been no active major battlefield on earth. This same fact inspires us to work all the more effectively with other nations for the well being, the freedom, the dignity, of every human on earth. These developments are heartening indeed, and we are hopeful of continuing progress. But sobering problems remain.

The massive military machines and ambitions of the Soviet-Communist bloc still create uneasiness in the world. All of us are aware of the continuing reliance of the Soviet Communists on military force, of the power of their weapons, of their present resistance to realistic armament limitation, and of their continuing effort to dominate or intimidate free nations on their periphery. Their steadily growing power includes an increasing strength in nuclear weapons. This power, combined with the proclaimed intentions of the Communist leaders to communize the world, is the threat confronting us today.

To protect our nations and our peoples from the catastrophe of a nuclear holocaust, free nations must maintain countervailing military power to persuade the Communists of the futility of

seeking their ends through aggression. If Communist rulers understand that America's response to aggression will be swift and decisive--that never shall we buy peace at the expense of honor or faith--they will be powerfully deterred from launching a military venture engulfing their own peoples and many others in disaster. This, of course, is merely world stalemate. But in this stalemate each of us may and must exercise his high duty to strive in every honorable way for enduring peace.

The military threat is but one menace to our freedom and security. We must not only deter aggression; we must also frustrate the effort of Communists to gain their goals by subversion. To this end, free nations must maintain and reinforce their cohesion, their internal security, their political and economic vitality, and their faith in freedom. In such a world, America's course is dear: We must tirelessly labor to make the peace more just and durable. We must strengthen the collective defense under the United Nations Charter and gird ourselves with sufficient military strength and productive capacity to discourage resort to war and protect our nation's vital interests.

We must continue to support and strengthen the United Nations. At this very moment, by vote of the United Nations General Assembly, its Secretary-General is in Communist China on a mission of deepest concern to all Americans: seeking the release of our never-to-be-forgotten American aviators and all other United Nations prisoners wrongfully detained by the Communist regime. We must also encourage the efforts being made in the United Nations to limit armaments and to harness the atom to peaceful rise. We must expand international trade and investment and assist friendly nations whose own best efforts are still insufficient to provide the strength essential to the security of the free world.We must be willing to use the processes of negotiation whenever they will advance the cause of just and secure peace to which the United States and other free nations are dedicated.

In respect to all these matters, we must, through a vigorous information program, keep the peoples of the world truthfully advised of our actions and purposes. This problem has been attacked with new vigor during the past months. I urge that the Congress give its earnest consideration to the great advantages that can accrue to our country through the successful operations of this program.

We must also carry forward our educational exchange program. This sharing of knowledge and experience between our citizens and those of free countries is a powerful factor in the development and maintenance of true partnership among free peoples. To advance these many efforts, the Congress must act in this session on appropriations, legislation, and treaties. Today I shall mention especially our foreign economic and military programs.

The recent economic progress in many free nations has been most heartening. The productivity of labor and the production of goods and services are increasing in ever-widening areas. There is a growing will to improve the living standards of all men. This progress is important to all our people. It promises us allies who are strong and self-reliant; it promises a growing world market for the products of our mines, our factories, and our farms.

But only through steady effort can we hope to continue this progress. Barriers still impede trade and the flow of capital needed to develop each nation's human and material resources. Wise reduction of these barriers is a long-term objective of our foreign economic policy--a policy of

an evolutionary and selective nature, assuring broad benefits to our own and other peoples.

We must gradually reduce certain tariff obstacles to trade. These actions should, of course, be accompanied by a similar lowering of trade barriers by other nations, so that we may move steadily toward greater economic advantage for all. We must further simplify customs administration and procedures. We must facilitate the flow of capital and continue technical assistance, both directly and through the United Nations, to less developed countries to strengthen their independence and raise their living standards. Many another step must be taken in and among the nations of the free world to release forces of private initiative. In our own nation, these forces have brought strength and prosperity; once released, they will generate rising incomes in these other countries with which to buy the products of American industry, labor and agriculture.

On January 10, by special message, I shall submit specific recommendations for carrying forward the legislative phases of our foreign economic policy. Our many efforts to build a better world include the maintenance of our military strength. This is a vast undertaking. Major national security programs consume two-thirds of the entire Federal budget. Over four million Americans--servicemen and civilians--are on the rolls of the defense establishment. During the past two years, by eliminating duplication and over staffing, by improved procurement and inventory controls, and by concentrating on the essentials, many billions of dollars have been saved in our defense activities. I should like to mention certain fundamentals underlying this vast program.

First, a realistic limitation of armaments and an enduring, just peace remain our national goals; we maintain powerful military forces because there is no present alternative--forces designed for deterrent and defensive purposes alone but able instantly to strike back with destructive power in response to an attack.

Second, we must stay alert to the fact that undue reliance on one weapon or preparation for only one kind of warfare simply invites an enemy to resort to another. We must, therefore, keep in our armed forces balance and flexibility adequate for our purposes and objectives.

Third, to keep our armed forces abreast of the advances of science, our military planning must be flexible enough to utilize the new weapons and techniques which flow ever more speedily from our research and development programs. The forthcoming military budget therefore emphasizes modern air power in the Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps and increases the emphasis on new weapons, especially those of rapid and destructive striking power. It assures the maintenance of effective, retaliatory force as the principal deterrent to overt aggression. It accelerates the continental defense program and the build-up of ready military reserve forces. It continues a vigorous program of stockpiling strategic and critical materials and strengthening our mobilization base. The budget also contemplates the strategic concentration of our strength through redeployment of certain forces. It provides for reduction of forces in certain categories and their expansion in others, to fit them to the military realities of our time. These emphases in our defense planning have been made at my personal direction after long and thoughtful study. In my judgment, they will give our nation a defense accurately adjusted to the national need.

Fourth, pending a world agreement on armament limitation, we must continue to improve and expand our supplies of nuclear weapons for our land, naval and air forces, while, at the same

time, continuing our encouraging progress in the peaceful use of atomic power.

And fifth, in the administration of these costly programs, we must demand the utmost in efficiency and ingenuity. We must assure our people not only of adequate protection but also of a defense that can be carried forward from year to year until the threat of aggression has disappeared.

To help maintain this kind of armed strength and improve its efficiency, I must urge the enactment of several important measures in this session. The first concerns the selective service act which expires next June 30th. For the foreseeable future, our standing forces must remain much larger than voluntary methods can sustain. We must, therefore, extend the statutory authority to induct men for two years of military service.

The second kind of measure concerns the rapid turnover of our most experienced servicemen. This process seriously weakens the combat readiness of our armed forces and is exorbitantly expensive. To encourage more trained servicemen to remain in uniform, I shall, on the thirteenth of this month, propose a number of measures to increase the attractions of a military career. These measures will include more adequate medical care for dependents, survivors' benefits, more and better housing, and selective adjustments in military pay and other allowances.

And third--also on January 13--I shall present a program to rebuild and strengthen the civilian components of our armed forces. This is a comprehensive program, designed to make better use of our manpower of military age. Because it will go far in assuring fair and equitable participation in military training and service, it is of particular importance to our combat veterans. In keeping with the historic military policy of our Republic, this program is designed to build and maintain powerful civilian reserves immediately capable of effective military service in an emergency in lieu of maintaining active duty forces in excess of the nation's immediate need.

Maintenance of an effective defense requires continuance of our aggressive attack on subversion at home. In this effort we have, in the past two years, made excellent progress. FBI investigations have been powerfully reinforced by a new Internal Security Division in the Department of Justice; the security activities of the Immigration and Naturalization Service have been revitalized; an improved and strengthened security system is in effect throughout the government; the Department of Justice and the FBI have been armed with effective new legal weapons forged by the 83rd Congress.

We shall continue to ferret out and to destroy Communist subversion. We shall, in the process, carefully preserve our traditions and the basic rights of our citizens. Our civil defense program is also a key element in the protection of our country. We are developing cooperative methods with State Governors, Mayors, and voluntary citizen groups, as well as among Federal agencies, in building the civil defense organization. Its significance in time of war is obvious; its swift assistance in disaster areas last year proved its importance in time of peace.

An industry capable of rapid expansion and essential materials and facilities swiftly available in time of emergency are indispensable to our defense. I urge, therefore, a two-year extension of the Defense Production Act and Title II of the First War Powers Act of 1941. These are cornerstones of our program for the development and maintenance of an adequate mobilization base. At this

point, I should like to make this additional observation. Our quest for peace and freedom necessarily presumes that we who hold positions of public trust must rise above self and section--that we must subordinate to the general good our partisan, our personal pride and prejudice. Tirelessly, with united purpose, we must fortify the material and spiritual foundations of this land of freedom and of free nations throughout the world. As never before, there is need for unhesitating cooperation among the branches of our government.

At this time the executive and legislative branches are under the management of different political parties. This fact places both parties on trial before the American people. In less perilous days of the past, division of governmental responsibility among our great parties has produced a paralyzing indecision. We must not let this happen in our time. We must avoid a paralysis of the will for peace and international security.

In the traditionally bipartisan areas--military security and foreign relations--I can report to you that I have already, with the leaders of this Congress, expressed assurances of unreserved cooperation. Yet, the strength of our country requires more than mere maintenance of military strength and success in foreign affairs; these vital matters are in turn dependent upon concerted and vigorous action in a number of supporting programs. I say, therefore, to the 84th Congress:

In all areas basic to the strength of America, there will be--to the extent I can insure them--cooperative, constructive relations between the Executive and Legislative Branches of this government. Let the general good be our yardstick on every great issue of our time.

Our efforts to defend our freedom and to secure a just peace are, of course, inseparable from the second great purpose of our government: to help maintain a strong, growing economy--an economy vigorous and free, in which there are ever-increasing opportunities, just rewards for effort, and a stable prosperity that is widely shared.

In the past two years, many important governmental Actions helped our economy adjust to conditions of peace; these and other actions created a climate for renewed economic growth. Controls were removed from wages, prices and materials. Tax revisions encouraged increased private spending and employment. Federal expenditures were sharply reduced, making possible a record tax cut. These actions, together with flexible monetary and debt management policies, helped to halt inflation and stabilize the value of the dollar. A program of cooperation and partnership in resource development was begun. Social security and unemployment insurance laws were broadened and strengthened. New laws started the long process of balancing farm production with farm markets. Expanded shipbuilding and stockpiling programs strengthened key sectors of the economy, while improving our mobilization base. A comprehensive new housing law brought impressive progress in an area fundamental to our economic strength and closed loopholes in the old laws permitting dishonest manipulation. Many of these programs are just beginning to exert their main stimulating effect upon the economy generally and upon specific communities and industries throughout the country.

The past year--1954--was one of the most prosperous years in our history. Business activity now surges with new strength. Production is rising. Employment is high. Toward the end of last year average weekly wages in manufacturing were higher than ever before. Personal income after taxes is at a record level. So is consumer spending. Construction activity is reaching new peaks. Export demand for our goods is strong. State and local government expenditures on public works

are rising. Savings are high, and credit is readily available.

So, today, the transition to a peacetime economy is largely behind us. The economic outlook is good. The many promising factors I have mentioned do not guarantee sustained economic expansion; however, they do give us a strong position from which to carry forward our economic growth. If we as a people act wisely, within ten years our annual national output can rise from its present level of about $360 billion to $500 billion, measured in dollars of stable buying power.

My Budget Message on January 17, the Economic Report on the 20th of this month, and several special messages will set forth in detail major programs to foster the growth of our economy and to protect the integrity of the people's money. Today I shall discuss these programs only in general terms.

Government efficiency and economy remain essential to steady progress toward a balanced budget. More than ten billion dollars were cut from the spending program proposed in the budget of January 9, 1953. Expenditures of that year were six and a half billion below those of the previous year. In the current fiscal year, government spending will be nearly four and a half billion dollars less than in the fiscal year which ended last June 30. New spending authority has been held below expenditures, reducing government obligations accumulated over the years.

Last year we had a large tax cut and, for the first time in seventy-five years a basic revision of Federal tax laws. It is now clear that defense and other essential government costs must remain at a level precluding further tax reductions this year. Although excise and corporation income taxes must, therefore, be continued at their present rates, further tax cuts will be possible when justified by lower expenditures and by revenue increases arising from the nation's economic growth. I am hopeful that such reductions can be made next year.

At the foundation of our economic growth are the raw materials and energy produced from our minerals and fuels, lands and forests, and water resources. With respect to them, I believe that the nation must adhere to three fundamental policies: first, to develop, wisely use and conserve basic resources from generation to generation; second, to follow the historic pattern of developing these resources primarily by private citizens under fair provisions of law, including restraints for proper conservation; and third, to treat resource development as a partnership undertaking--a partnership in which the participation of private citizens and State and local governments is as necessary as Federal participation.

This policy of partnership and cooperation is producing good results, most immediately noticeable in respect to water resources. First, it has encouraged local public bodies and private citizens to plan their own power sources. Increasing numbers of applications to the Federal Power Commission to conduct surveys and prepare plans for power development, notably in the Columbia River Basin, are evidence of local response.

Second, the Federal Government and local and private organizations have been encouraged to coordinate their developments. This is important because Federal hydroelectric developments supply but a small fraction of the nation's power needs. Such partnership projects as Priest Rapids in Washington, the Coosa River development in Alabama, and Markham Ferry in Oklahoma already have the approval of the Congress. This year justifiable projects of a similar nature will again have Administration support.

Third, the Federal Government must shoulder its own partnership obligations by undertaking projects of such complexity and size that their success requires Federal development. In keeping with this principle, I again urge the Congress to approve the development of the Upper Colorado River Basin to conserve and assure better use of precious water essential to the future of the West.

In addition, the 1956 budget will recommend appropriations to start six new reclamation and more than thirty new Corps of Engineers projects of varying size. Going projects and investigations of potential new resource developments will be continued.

Although this partnership approach is producing encouraging results, its full success requires a nation-wide comprehensive water resources policy firmly based in law. Such a policy is under preparation and when completed will be submitted to the Congress.

In the interest of their proper conservation, development and use, continued vigilance will be maintained over our fisheries, wildlife resources, the national parks and forests, and the public lands; and we shall continue to encourage an orderly development of the nation's mineral resources.

A modern, efficient highway system is essential to meet the needs of our growing population, our expanding economy, and our national security. We are accelerating our highway improvement program as rapidly as possible under existing State and Federal laws and authorizations. However, this effort will not in itself assure our people of an adequate highway system. On my recommendation, this problem has been carefully considered by the Conference of State Governors and by a special Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program, composed of leading private citizens. I have received the recommendations of the Governors' Conference and will shortly receive the views of the special Advisory Committee. Aided by their findings, I shall submit on January 27th detailed recommendations which will meet our most pressing national highway needs.

In further recognition of the importance of transportation to our economic strength and security, the Administration, through a Cabinet committee, is thoroughly examining existing Federal transportation policies to determine their effect on the adequacy of transportation services. This is the first such comprehensive review directly undertaken by the Executive Branch of the government in modern times. We are not only examining major problems facing the various modes of transport; we are also studying closely the inter-relationships of civilian and government requirements for transportation. Legislation will be recommended to correct policy deficiencies which we may find.

The nation's public works activities are tremendous in scope. It is expected that more than $ 12 billion will be expended in 1955 for the development of land, water and other resources; control of floods, and navigation and harbor improvements; construction of roads, schools, and municipal water supplies, and disposal of domestic and industrial wastes. Many of the Federal, State and local agencies responsible for this work are, in their separate capacities, highly efficient. But public works activities are closely inter-related and have a substantial influence on the growth of the country. Moreover, in times of threatening economic contraction, they may become a valuable sustaining force. To these ends, efficient planning and execution of the nation's public works require both the coordination of Federal activities and effective

cooperation with State and local governments.

The Council of Economic Advisers, through its public works planning section, has made important advances during the past year in effecting this coordination and cooperation. In view of the success of these initial efforts, and to give more emphasis and continuity to this essential coordination, I shall request the Congress to appropriate funds for the support of an Office of Coordinator of Public Works in the Executive Office of the President.

A most significant element in our growing economy is an agriculture that is stable, prosperous and free. The problems of our agriculture have evolved over many years and cannot be solved overnight; nevertheless, governmental actions last year hold great promise of fostering a better balance between production and markets and, consequently, a better and more stable income for our farmers.

Through vigorous administration and through new authority provided by the 83rd Congress, surplus farm products are now moving into consumption. From February 1953 through November 1954, the rate of increase of government-held surpluses has been reduced by our moving into use more than 2.3 billion dollars' worth of government-owned farm commodities; this amount is equal to more than seven percent of a year's production of all our farms and ranches. Domestic consumption remains high, and farm exports will be higher than last year. As a result of the flexibility provided by the Agricultural Act of 1954, we can move toward less restrictive acreage controls.

Thus, farm production is gradually adjusting to markets, markets are being expanded, and stocks are moving into use. We can now look forward to an easing of the influences depressing farm prices, to reduced government expenditures for purchase of surplus products, and to less Federal intrusion into the lives and plans of our farm people. Agricultural programs have been redirected toward better balance, greater stability and sustained prosperity. We are headed in the right direction. I urgently recommend to the Congress that we continue resolutely on this road.

Greater attention must be directed to the needs of low-income farm families. Twenty-eight per cent of our farm-operator families have net cash incomes of less than $1,000 per year. Last year, at my request, careful studies were made of the problems of these farm people. I shall later submit recommendations designed to assure the steady alleviation of their most pressing concerns.

Because drought also remains a serious agricultural problem, I shall recommend legislation to strengthen Federal disaster assistance programs. This legislation will prescribe an improved appraisal of need, better adjustment of the various programs to local conditions, and a more equitable sharing of costs between the States and the Federal Government.

The prosperity of our small business enterprises is an indispensable element in the maintenance of our economic strength. Creation of the Small Business Administration and recently enacted tax laws facilitating small business expansion are but two of many important steps we have taken to encourage our smaller enterprises. I recommend that the Congress extend the Small Business Act of 1953 which is due to expire next June. We come now to the third great purpose of our government-its concern for the health, productivity and well-being of all our people.

Every citizen wants to give full expression to his God-given talents and abilities and to have the

recognition and respect accorded under our religious and political traditions. Americans also want a good material standard of living--not simply to accumulate possessions, but to fulfill a legitimate aspiration for an environment in which their families may live meaningful and happy lives. Our people are committed, therefore, to the creation and preservation of opportunity for every citizen to lead a more rewarding life. They are equally committed to the alleviation of misfortune and distress among their fellow citizens.

The aspirations of most of our people can best be fulfilled through their own enterprise and initiative, without government interference. This Administration, therefore, follows two simple rules: first, the Federal Government should perform an essential task only when it cannot otherwise be adequately performed; and second, in performing that task, our government must not impair the self-respect, freedom and incentive of the individual. So long as these two rules are observed, the government can fully meet its obligation without creating a dependent population or a domineering bureaucracy.

During the past two years, notable advances were made in these functions of government. Protection of old-age and survivors' insurance was extended to an additional ten million of our people, and the benefits were substantially increased. Legislation was enacted to provide unemployment insurance protection to some four million additional Americans. Stabilization of living costs and the halting of inflation protected the value of pensions and savings. A broad program now helps to bring good homes within the reach of the great majority of our people. With the States, we are providing rehabilitation facilities and more clinics, hospitals, and nursing homes for patients with chronic illnesses. Also with the States, we have begun a great and fruitful expansion in the restoration of disabled persons to employment and useful lives. In the areas of Federal responsibility, we have made historic progress in eliminating from among our people demeaning practices based on race or color. All of us may be proud of these achievements during the past two years. Yet essential Federal tasks remain to be done.

As part of our efforts to provide decent, safe and sanitary housing for low-income families, we must carry forward the housing program authorized during the 83rd Congress. We must also authorize contracts for a firm program of 35,000 additional public housing units in each of the next two fiscal years. This program will meet the most pressing obligations of the Federal Government into the 1958 fiscal year for planning and building public housing. By that time the private building industry, aided by the Housing Act of 1954, will have had the opportunity to assume its full role in providing adequate housing for our low income families.

The health of our people is one of our most precious assets. Preventable sickness should be prevented; knowledge available to combat disease and disability should be fully used. Otherwise, we as a people are guilty not only of neglect of human suffering but also of wasting our national strength.

Constant advances in medical care are not available to enough of our citizens. Clearly our nation must do more to reduce the impact of accident and disease. Two fundamental problems confront us: first, high and ever-rising costs of health services; second, serious gaps and shortages in these services.

By special message on January 24, I shall propose a coordinated program to strengthen and improve existing health services. This program will continue to reject socialized medicine. It will

emphasize individual and local responsibility. Under it the Federal Government will neither dominate nor direct, but serve as a helpful partner. Within this framework, the program can be broad in scope.

My recommendations will include a Federal health reinsurance service to encourage the development of more and better voluntary health insurance coverage by private organizations. I shall also recommend measures to improve the medical care of that group of our citizens who, because of need, receive Federal-State public assistance. These two proposals will help more of our people to meet the costs of health services.

To reduce the gaps in these services, I shall propose: New measures to facilitate construction of needed health facilities and help reduce shortages of trained health personnel; Vigorous steps to combat the misery and national loss involved in mental illness; Improved services for crippled children and for maternal and child health; Better consumer protection under our existing pure food and drug laws; and, finally, Strengthened programs to combat the increasingly serious pollution of our rivers and streams and the growing problem of air pollution. These measures together constitute a comprehensive program holding rich promise for better health for all of our people. Last year's expansion of social security coverage and our new program of improved medical care for public assistance recipients together suggest modification of the formula for Federal sharing in old age assistance payments. I recommend modification of the formula where such payments will, in the future, supplement benefits received under the old age and survivors insurance system.

It is the inalienable right of every person, from childhood on, to have access to knowledge. In our form of society, this right of the individual takes on a special meaning, for the education of all our citizens is imperative to the maintenance and invigoration of America's free institutions. Today, we face grave educational problems. Effective and up-to-date analyses of these problems and their solutions are being carried forward through the individual State conferences and the White House Conference to be completed this year.

However, such factors as population growth, additional responsibilities of schools, and increased and longer school attendance have produced an unprecedented classroom shortage. This shortage is of immediate concern to all of our people. Positive, affirmative action must be taken now. Without impairing in any way the responsibilities of our States, localities, communities, or families, the Federal government can and should serve as an effective-catalyst in dealing with this problem. I shall forward a special message to the Congress on February 15, presenting an affirmative program dealing with this shortage.

To help the States do a better and more timely job, we must strengthen their resources for preventing and dealing with juvenile delinquency. I shall propose Federal legislation to assist the States to promote concerted action in dealing with this nationwide problem. I shall carry forward the vigorous efforts of the Administration to improve the international control of the traffic in narcotics and, in cooperation with State and local agencies, to combat narcotic addiction in our country.

I should like to speak now of additional matters of importance to all our people and especially to our wage earners. During the past year certain industrial changes and the readjustment of the economy to conditions of peace brought unemployment and other difficulties to various localities

and industries. These problems are engaging our most earnest attention. But for the overwhelming majority of our working people, the past year has meant good jobs. Moreover, the earnings and savings of our wage earners are no longer depreciating in value. Because of cooperative relations between labor and management, fewer working days were lost through strikes in 1954 than in any year in the past decade.

The outlook for our wage earners can be made still more promising by several legislative actions. First, in the past five years we have had economic growth which will support an increase in the Federal minimum wage. In the light of present economic conditions, I recommend its increase to ninety cents an hour. I also recommend that many others, at present excluded, be given the protection of a minimum wage.

Second, I renew my recommendation of last year for amendment of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 to further the basic objectives of this statute. I especially call to the attention of the Congress amendments dealing with the right of economic strikers to vote in representation elections and the need for equalizing the obligation under the Act to file disclaimers of Communist affiliation.

Third, the Administration will propose other important measures including occupational safety, workmen's compensation for longshoremen and harbor workers, and the "Eight Hour Laws" applicable to Federal contractors. Legislation will also be proposed respecting nonoccupational disability insurance and unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia.

In considering human needs, the Federal Government must take special responsibility for citizens in its direct employ. On January 11 I shall propose a pay adjustment plan for civilian employees outside the Postal Field Service to correct inequities and increase individual pay rates. I shall also recommend voluntary health insurance on a contributory basis for Federal employees and their dependents. In keeping with the Group Life Insurance Act passed in the 83rd Congress, this protection should be provided on the group insurance principle and purchased from private facilities. Also on January 11 I shall recommend a modern pay plan, including pay increases, for postal field employees. As part of this program, and to carry forward our progress toward elimination of the large annual postal deficit. I shall renew my request for an increase in postal rates. Again I urge that in the future the fixing of rates be delegated to an impartial, independent body.

More adequate training programs to equip career employees of the government to render improved public service will be recommended, as will improvements in the laws affecting employees serving on foreign assignments. Needed improvements in survivor, disability, and retirement benefits for Federal civilian and military personnel have been extensively considered by the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal personnel. The Committee's proposals would strengthen and improve benefits for our career people in government, and I endorse their broad objectives. Full contributory coverage under old-age and survivors' insurance should be made available to all Federal personnel, just as in private industry. For career military personnel, the protection of the old-age and survivors' insurance system would be an important and long-needed addition, especially to their present unequal and inadequate survivorship protection. The military retirement pay system should remain separate and unchanged. Certain adjustments in the present civilian personnel retirement systems will be needed to reflect the additional protection of old-age and survivors' insurance. However, these systems also are a basic part of a total

compensation and should be separately and independently retained.

I also urge the Congress to approve a long overdue increase in the salaries of Members of the Congress and of the Federal judiciary to a level commensurate with their heavy responsibilities.

Our concern for the individual in our country requires that we consider several additional problems. We must continue our program to help our Indian citizens improve their lot and make their full contribution to national life. Two years ago I advised the Congress of injustices under existing immigration laws. Through humane administration, the Department of Justice is doing what it legally can to alleviate hardships. Clearance of aliens before arrival has been initiated, and except for criminal offenders, the imprisonment of aliens awaiting admission or deportation has been stopped. Certain provisions of law, however, have the effect of compelling action in respect to aliens which are inequitable in some instances and discriminatory in others. These provisions should be corrected in this session of the Congress. As the complex problems of Alaska are resolved, that Territory should expect to achieve statehood. In the meantime, there is no justification for deferring the admission to statehood of Hawaii. I again urge approval of this measure.

We have three splendid opportunities to demonstrate the strength of our belief in the right of suffrage. First, I again urge that a Constitutional amendment be submitted to the States to reduce the voting age for Federal elections. Second, I renew my request that the principle of self-government be extended and the right of suffrage granted to the citizens of the District of Columbia. Third, I again recommend that we work with the States to preserve the voting fights of citizens in the nation's service overseas.

In our determination to keep faith with those who in the past have met the highest call of citizenship, we now have under study the system of benefits for veterans and for surviving dependents of deceased veterans and servicemen. Studies will be undertaken to determine the need for measures to ease the readjustment to civilian life of men required to enter the armed forces for two years of service.

In the advancement of the various activities which will make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities. I shall recommend the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts within the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, to advise the Federal Government on ways to encourage artistic endeavor and appreciation. I shall also propose that awards of merit be established whereby we can honor our fellow citizens who make great contribution to the advancement of our civilization.

Every citizen rightly expects efficient and economical administration of these many government programs I have outlined today. I strongly recommend extension of the Reorganization Act and the law establishing the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, both of which expire this spring. Thus the Congress will assure continuation of the excellent progress recently made in improving government organization and administration. In this connection we are looking forward with great interest to the reports which will soon be going to the Congress from the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. I am sure that these studies, made under the chairmanship of former President Herbert Hoover with the assistance of more than two hundred distinguished citizens, will be of great value in paving the way toward

more efficiency and economy in the government.

And now, I return to the point at which I began--the faith of our people.

The many programs here summarized are, I believe, in full keeping with their needs, interests and aspirations. The obligations upon us are clear: To labor earnestly, patiently, prayerfully, for peace, for freedom, for justice, throughout the world; To keep our economy vigorous and free, that our people may lead fuller, happier lives; To advance, not merely by our words but by our acts, the determination of our government that every citizen shall have opportunity to develop to his fullest capacity.

As we do these things, before us is a future filled with opportunity and hope. That future will be ours if in our time we keep alive the patience, the courage, the confidence in tomorrow, the deep faith, of the millions who, in years past, made and preserved us this nation.

A decade ago, in the death and desolation of European battlefields, I saw the courage and resolution, I felt the inspiration, of American youth. In these young men I felt America's buoyant confidence and irresistible will-to-do. In them I saw, too, a devout America, humble before God.

And so, I know with all my heart--and I deeply believe that all Americans know--that, despite the anxieties of this divided world, our faith, and the cause in which we all believe, will surely prevail.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

NOTE: This is the text of the document which the President signed and transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives (H. Doc. 1, 84th Cong., 1st Sess.). The address as reported from the floor appears in the Congressional Record (vol. 101, p. 94).

(10) President's Press Conference January 12, 1955 [President Eisenhower's fifty-seventh news conference was held in the Executive office Building from 10:33 to 11:06am, in attendance: 177.]

EL-Dl6-57 (PC)

[This is a complete transcript of the news conference of this date. No portion of the conference was released for broadcasting or direct quotation at that time.]

THE PRESIDENT. Please be seated.

I don't think I have had a chance to say Happy New Year to you, which I say now.

There is only one short announcement. We have been reading in the papers about this trouble in Costa Rica, and I am informed that the commission set up by the Organization of American States, which has been successful in the past in settling disputes, left about 6:18 this morning for the scene of the trouble.

So, of course, we will have nothing to say about it here until that investigation is complete and the report is made. All right, we will go to questions.

Q. Marvin L. Arrowsmith, Associated Press: Mr. President, do you see any need for any basic

revision of the security program under which the Agriculture Department found Wolf Ladejinsky a security risk after the State Department had cleared him, and under which the Foreign Operations Administration then gave him full security clearance and a new sensitive job?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, Mr. Arrowsmith, you state certain things in your question that I am not exactly sure are exactly right. For example, did they put him in a particularly sensitive job? I am not sure.

In anything as delicate as is this security program, when the effort is to make certain that the Government is served by the finest people you can get, and where, at the same time, you don't want to take unnecessary risks of damaging the reputations of people who are, many reasons to believe, honest and sincere, it is a delicate operation and judgments will differ.

Now, as you know, responsibility is placed by law upon the heads of the departments. In this case, on the evidence available, one department believed that the best interests of Government would be served by not hiring this man. Others differ. Obviously, it was a case where the evidence was of a kind that was not conclusive, apparently, to the other people. I have not been through this evidence in detail. I have seen the summarized reports of it.

Now, this is one reason we have set up in the Department of Justice a separate special group under Mr. Tompkins, I believe his name is, to specialize in these matters and to be available as an adviser. He can't take the responsibility; that belongs to the Department head, but he can be a special adviser and counsel in these delicate cases.

I would be the last to say that the program we have devised is perfect. Of course, it isn't. It has been made by humans, and it is bound to have its imperfections. These are difficult matters. Now, we constantly seek ways to improve. I know of no subject that takes so much time on the part of the entire Cabinet, both individually and collectively, as trying to get this thing absolutely straightened out. Now, while perfection will not be obtained, improvement will always be obtained; that is about all I can tell you.

Q. Merriman Smith, United Press: Mr. President, I am sure you are aware that Vice President Nixon has been attacked and criticized by certain political elements since the election for the manner in which he conducted himself during the 1954 congressional campaign. We are aware, too, that you wrote Mr. Nixon a congratulatory letter in late October. I wonder how you feel about these recent criticisms of the Vice President?

THE PRESIDENT. I think here, Mr. Smith, I have a right to ask you one question. [Laughter] Is your question based upon an actual reading of Mr. Nixon's speeches or what you have learned from what the critics say about his speeches? In other words, have you read his speeches in detail?

Q. Mr. Smith: Yes, sir. My question was based on the Democratic criticism of him, not as to what he said, not as to the content of his speeches.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I know this--I am going to give you just a few facts: I think it was before this body that once I found it necessary to say, and I know I have said it elsewhere, that I don't consider any party other than the Communists in the United States to be a party of treason; that there are just as many patriots and loyal and wonderful Americans in one of the great parties

as in the other. So any sweeping condemnation of any party, certainly I have never made, and I have never heard of Mr. Nixon making them. On the contrary, he has assured me time and again he has never by any implication tried to condemn an entire party. He has talked about certain individual cases and the way they were handled administratively, and he has questioned good judgment but never loyalty. Now, exactly what these criticisms are trying to do, I am not so certain; but just as I defend and believe in the loyalty, the patriotism of some of the people that are possibly making the criticisms, I certainly believe in the loyalty and patriotism of Dick Nixon. I admire him. So I would be loath to believe that he was guilty of indiscretions, although I do admit that in the heat of campaign, words, particularly if they are taken out of context, can be made the subject of possibly legitimate criticisms.

Q. Joseph C. Harsch, Christian Science Monitor: Mr. President, in your letter to Secretary Wilson about the new military budget you referred to the need for mobile forces, and you said we should "provide for meeting lesser hostile" acts in situations "not broadened by the intervention of a major aggressor's forces." Could you enlarge for us your concept of what these mobile forces would be like, the means for giving them mobility, their equipment and their weapons?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I wouldn't attempt to describe in detail because there is no military situation that can be visualized entirely in advance, and the cure prescribed. What we are trying to do around the world is to build up indigenous forces that can assure orderly government within the country and normally take care of any difficulty of rebellion, subversion, where there isn't. major outside interference. Consequently, the thought would be that if you were called upon by an established and friendly government to help out in some situation, that light forces, probably going in there by air, or fleet marine units in a nearby area could come in, and that would be sufficient to help out. Now, I can't possibly describe to you in all details, because they would vary in severity from something of a very minor character on up. The fact of it is that you have got to have things ready to move--and ready to move rapidly. I believe a stitch in time in this case is often one of those things that could save possibly very great disaster later.

Q. Mr. Harsch: Do you contemplate their using tactical atomic weapons, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. I would say, normally no, because I can't conceive of an atomic weapon as being a police weapon, and we were talking really more police action. Police are to protect and stop trouble, not just to cause destruction. Now, nothing can be precluded in a military thing. Remember this: when you resort to force as the arbiter of human difficulty, you don't know where you are going; but, generally speaking, if you get deeper and deeper, there is just no limit except what is imposed by the limitations of force itself. But I would say, normally no, would be my answer.

Q. Joseph A. Loftus, New York Times: With respect to the security program, Mr. President, can you say, is there anything specific being done or under consideration to revise it?

THE PRESIDENT. To do what?

Q. Mr. Loftus: To revise it or make any changes in the processes.

THE PRESIDENT. No, other than the studies that come constantly from the group, that specialized group, that we have set up for watching, trying to improve, this thing; that is the

place from where I would expect it.

Q. Chalmers M. Roberts, Washington Post and Times Herald: In connection with Mr. Harsch's question, in your state of the Union message, I believe it .was, you have said that we should not have an undue reliance on one Weapon, and you referred to flexibility of forces. Yet the general assumption in Washington appears to be that our forces are moving towards making nuclear weapons conventional weapons. I think you have even used that phrase yourself. When you were referring to not having undue reliance on one type of weapon, were you drawing a line between nuclear and non-nuclear or between strategic and tactical-types of nuclear weapons?

THE PRESIDENT. No. I just said this: you cannot have too great a reliance on one kind of formation, one type of weapon, one kind of vehicle, or any other thing in an army. It has to be rounded, because you can't tell where is going to be the place you have to use your forces or the conditions under which you will have to use them. At the same time, though, that I urged that, I did urge this: that our forces, their formation, their training, their doctrine, keep pace with what science is constantly giving to us--in fact, forcing upon us. Now, you have got to be ready to do all of these things. And because this is so expensive, the only thing I say is, let's make certain that everything we do we need. It is no crime, you know, as far as I can see, to try to be effective and efficient and economical. That is what we are trying to do. Therefore, we must have what we need, and no more taken out, staying constantly in forces that are, after all, negative in their purpose; they are to protect what you have got, not to produce. So my whole effort is to keep the kind of forces that can meet our situations logically, particularly those that can threaten directly our vital interests. I repeat again, which I have stated here so often, what is the thing today that, for the first time in our history, gives us legitimate cause for alarm as to our own safety? It is the advent of the atomic weapon, the weapon of great destructive force, and with means for delivering it. Up until that time, the oceans had seemed to us such wonderful protective areas that we could well afford the, almost, the unpreparedness that has been our history from the Revolutionary War down to the Korean War. We no longer can afford it. Now, that is all.

Q. Mr. Roberts: Sir, may I ask, as a military man would you say that it is possible to draw a distinction between strategic and tactical nuclear weapons?

THE PRESIDENT. As a matter of fact, I don't think it's possible to draw a sharp line even between strategy and tactics. I don't believe it is possible. Every expert, everybody that has ever written on this subject, has had his own definition of strategy and his own definition of tactics. They do merge, there is no sharp line. But I would say this: every military problem finally brings forward its own logical way of solving what you have to apply, when. Now, war is a political act, so politics--that is, world politics--are just as important in making your decisions as is the character of the weapon you use. I can't possibly stand here and, unless we take the world, construct for ourselves a logical military problem, could I give you my solution to that problem. I can't do it in the abstract. It is just impossible. But I do say you can draw no sharp line between tactical use of atomic weapons and strategic use.

Q. Clark R. Mollenhoff, Des Moines Register and Tribune: Mr. President, the Secretary of Agriculture, in commenting on the Ladejinsky case, branded Ladejinsky flatly as a member of two Communist front organizations, and as an economist, analyst, and investigator for Amtorg, the Russian trading agency.

THE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Q. Mr. Mollenhoff: If those facts are true, how can the FOA and the State Department clear this man, and Mr. Benson has not taken a backward step on his position? The other two departments have gone ahead, and these are facts that still stand on the record against the man.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I am really not going to try to say what animated either side. I do say here are honest men approaching this problem. They have reached different answers, that is obvious. One attached unquestionably more importance to a past association, particularly in Amtorg, than do the others, who say that is a long time in the past and the man has had a lot of chances to reform. This man, by the way, I believe, wrote a book in which he was very severely critical of communism--in fact, condemned it; so you have got a nice balance in the case, and one believes one thing and the other believes another.

Q. Mr. Mollenhoff: Mr. President, in connection with that, the Agriculture Department stated that he had a high position in Amtorg, and set it out specifically. In the State Department loyalty investigation, security investigation, he denied this under oath. This would seem to me to raise a pretty serious question, if the Agriculture Department is correct.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I will tell you: I know of nothing you can do with this except to go to the people responsible for the decisions directly and ask them the questions.

Q. Mr. Mollenhoff: Mr. President, will the White House make sure that we can get some of those answers?

THE PRESIDENT. I can't assure it. These people are responsible people, but you ought go and try it, I should think.

Q. Ray L. Scherer, National Broadcasting Company: Mr. President, it has been reported to us that you favor shifting the presidential convention to September, thus making for a shorter campaign, which is the subject of considerable interest to a lot of people in this room. I wonder if you care to give us your views on that.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, now, this is what I said: they came to me--I mean the group, the chairman, I think it was--some weeks ago, and asked me what I would think about a later convention and shorter campaign. I said this at least: that if they would consult whoever was to be the candidate, I am sure he would favor it because he would have a shorter period in which he goes through an experience that only some of you who have traveled on one of those trains from beginning to end can have a faint idea--and it is only faint at that, I assure you. So I said that I really thought it was foolish to drag the thing out. But they brought up to me other considerations. You still have your primaries by law early in the year; and now what's going to happen through this long year of uncertainty and conflicting ambitions? I am sure it is one of those things I wouldn't be too positive about. My impression is that it would be well to have later conventions.

Q. Daniel L. Schorr, CBS News: Mr. President, were you aware, sir, in approving the idea of a late convention that you would be giving the impression that you will be the candidate?

THE PRESIDENT. Bosh! [Laughter]

Q. Cabell Phillips, New York Times: Mr. President, it wasn't clear from your answer to the earlier question as to whether Mr. Tompkins' unit in the Department of Justice has created a special group to study this security problem or whether it is just a part of their continuing study and responsibility.

THE PRESIDENT. It was set up as a special unit in the Attorney General's Office to have this one problem; to study how to avoid, all fight, anomalies like just have occurred; to see whether, through giving expert advice, and all the way through, they can be helpful to each of the departments which must themselves carry the responsibility.

Q. Mr. Phillips: May I also ask, sir, are you contemplating the appointment of a special commission of private citizens possibly to work with Senators and others in the Government to study this?

THE PRESIDENT. That has been proposed from the beginning; of course, we had something like that, you know, under Senator Bingham when I came in here, to this office. It has been back and forth. I see no way right now in which such a commission could be helpful. Here is something that I know that honest men are studying every day, both collectively and individually, and if I do become convinced that such a commission is advisable, well then, of course, I will call on them. At this moment I don't see it.

Q. Richard L. Wilson, Cowles Publications: I would like to ask you for an elaboration of the remark you made earlier in which you said you had seen the summary of the Ladejinsky case, and I would like to ask you if you had formed any conclusion of your own as a result of reading this summary, and if so, what that conclusion was?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, it might be a little unfair to tell the details because it was so informal, but the summary of this was read to me by the Secretary of Agriculture, and as he read it to me, I said, "Well, that would scare me." I think those are the words that I said because he was talking about hiring a new man. I didn't inquire into all of the circumstances, and it was my impression that both State and Agriculture felt the same way at that time, so I just said that. I never actually read it. I listened to it and just made that remark. I have never myself formed a judgment on this case because I just haven't time to take up the details of every one of these cases.

Q. Mr. Wilson: But you did feel, sir, that on the preliminary showing there was a reasonable doubt about Ladejinsky's security?

THE PRESIDENT. I thought there was some doubt about it. Now, as I say, remember I hadn't studied the other side of the question. It was brought up here that certain things were so. For instance, I think at that moment I doubt I knew the man had written a book on the other side of the question.

Q. Sarah McClendon, El Paso Times: Mr. President, before you appoint the new Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, would you be inquiring into his philosophy to see if he favors new entries in the field of commercial aviation and competition?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I would certainly inquire into his general philosophy as to the relationship of government and free enterprise, but I would never really insult any individual by trying to ask him about his answers in advance to specific questions of every kind, whether he

favors a route here or a route there. If a man would give me an answer to a question like that, I should never appoint him, I assure you. I would want to know what was his attitude toward efficient competition in this field, not just putting up competition in order to get another firm that the Government can pay money to because the law says they must be profitable.

Q. Alan S. Emory, Watertown Times: Mr. President, a Senate rules subcommittee, headed by Senator Jenner, in his recommendations a few days ago, recommended that newspapermen as witnesses before congressional committees be compelled to disclose their sources of information. I wonder if you had any comment on that?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I have never heard of such a thing before. I guess I am mistaken. I understood that the courts have time and again upheld the right of newspaper people to withhold that, but I may be wrong. But I haven't any comment because I don't know enough about it to talk intelligently about it.

Q. Kenneth M. Scheibel, Gannett Newspapers: Mr. President, could you tell us your views now about the question of developing the Niagara power, whether you would favor private enterprise to develop that or a public body?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think it is a decision of New York State, as I understand it. That job has been turned over to New York.

Q. Mr. Scheibel: Well, inasmuch as the Federal Government must issue a license to any group which does it, might you have a preference?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I don't think it makes any difference whether I do or not. I am not decisive in such a case. I haven't had a chance to study this particular one. Generally speaking, I believe that the closer to the scene of action decision can be taken by that level of government, the better it is. I would rather the State would make the. decision than the Federal Government, because I believe they are right there. Now, if we do have to approve the license, I believe that the CAB [FPC]--no, in that case the Congress reserved to itself the right to approve the license. Isn't that the one that they reserved? [Confers with Mr. Hagerty]. Well, it's Federal Power. I think the Congress reserved it to itself in that case, unless my memory is wrong. But I do believe that when we have an established body like the CAB [FPC] that the CAB [FPC] working in cooperation with the State is better than to inject another Federal influence in the matter.

Q. Nat S. Finney, Buffalo Evening News: Mr. President, the Atomic Energy Commission sent the new schedule of its prices on uranium, and so forth, over to the Joint Committee on the Hill, as a classified document. Senator Anderson, the new chairman of the committee, told me yesterday that he refused to receive it as a classified document, and sent it back, and is raising the question as to whether those prices should or should not be secret. Can you throw any light on that problem?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I will say this: as of now, the Chairman believes that the promiscuous publication of their price structure would almost necessarily be revealing of things that shouldn't be broadcast. Now, obviously, both the committee, any bidding firms, any people that are properly cleared, must know about it; and I don't suppose that you could rate it, therefore, in the long run as the most delicate secret that the Government has. I haven't discussed this thing in detail with the head of the Commission, and this is the first time I had heard that they didn't

accept it. But if it has become a matter of argument, I think that Chairman Strauss will be in to see me, and we will reach a real conclusion on it.

Q. Mr. Finney: Mr. President, the debate has already started on the question of whether these prices are too high or too low, and we face the prospect of a public discussion, public debate over this question without any public knowledge of what the prices are.

THE PRESIDENT [laughing]. Well, I will have to take a look. You are bringing up one that I only knew that he did favor some restriction on it.

Q. Edward T. Folliard, Washington Post and Times Herald: Mr. President, it seems to me that there is still an unanswered question in connection with the Ladejinsky case. You have told how Secretary Benson read you a summary. You say, sir, that that scared you.

THE PRESIDENT. I didn't say "scared." I said, "Well, that would scare me," meaning that I would take a very jaundiced look at it.

Q. Mr. Foillard: I see. And that it did create a reasonable doubt in your mind?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Q. Mr. Foillard: Now the question is: Did Mr. Stassen, in hiring Ladejinsky, did he know about your state of mind, that is, that you had a reasonable doubt?

THE PRESIDENT. I don't know, Mr. Folliard. I assume that he did because in the conversations that these men must have had, certainly they would have said that the matter had been suggested to me. But that is the only time, I will say, that the matter has ever been brought to me directly. I simply assure you, I am not going to go into those matters in detail, because it would break the back of any man if he tried to do that; these come up not only in such a highly publicized case as you are now talking about, but they come up every day. This one happened to affect two departments, and for that reason was suggested to me.

Q. William H. Lawrence, New York Times: We have been under the impression that because State took one view and Agriculture took another, that Mr. Stassen had clearance from the White House, and by that, sir, I do not necessarily mean you--

THE PRESIDENT, No.

Q. Mr, Lawrence: Before he undertook to hire Mr, Ladejinsky.

THE PRESIDENT. He may have. I will tell you this, gentlemen: here is a difficult question to answer, and there are all stages of security and, let's say, sensitive positions. If Mr. Stassen thought that this man could acceptably fill the position, that it was not so sensitive that he could damage the United States, and that this was a good thing for the Government, then I would uphold his right to do it. But, remember this: he has to stand responsible, and, if something would turn up to show that his judgment was wrong, then he is the one that is held responsible. And remember this: each one of these heads of department is running an enormous organization. He himself has to work to find time to deal with these delicate cases; so, therefore, you have got to stand and back him up, which I do. In this case, I must say, it has created a situation that is certainly not easy to explain, but I do uphold the right of each to make his own decision in the

matter.

Q. Paul Martin, Gannett Newspapers: Mr. President, in your discussions with Governor Dewey this week, did you talk about the possibility of him taking an appointment in the administration?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I will tell you one thing, most of the time taken up between Mr. Dewey and me was his describing to me the joys of private life. [Laughter]

Q. Norman Carignan, Associated Press: Mr. President, there are reports that your brother, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, might make a speech some time soon in Texas on Latin American relations.

THE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Q. Mr. Carignan: I wonder if you could tell us about that.

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, that is correct. It is early February some time, and, of course, we have--[confers with Mr. Hagerty]-yes, Dallas Council of World Affairs. It is on the Latin American scene and situation in which, of course, my brother has taken a tremendous interest and remains, I think, very close to the State Department in discussing it.

Q. Charles S. von Fremd, CBS News: Mr. President, I would like to ask a question, sir, which I am not, in turn, asking for a yes or no answer. It has to do with whether or not you may be a candidate in '56, and I ask it for this reason: there have been a number of people, politicians, who have said that they believe you will run for one big reason, and that is the word "duty," that they feel that as a man who spent more than 40 years of his life serving his country, that it is unthinkable that you could again refuse another call to duty. I wonder if you could comment on that and, possibly, give us your interpretation of the responsibility of duty.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, you put up the big question. I hope that I would never be sufficiently self-centered that I would fail to respond to a call to duty, but who is to define for any individual his duty in such a case as this? I just can't say anything more at the moment. In one form or another, this question has kept popping at me about duty ever since 1943, June. I will never forget the day. [Laughter] Now, I finally think that in such cases the individual has to determine what he believes to be best for the country, because he is the only one to make the decision. As I say, I hope I would never fail to do my duty, but I would certainly want to know in critical circumstances what is my duty.

Q. Robert G. Spivack, New York Post: Mr. President, in view of what has been said here this morning and in view of Secretary Benson's persistence in regarding Mr. Ladejinsky as a security risk, won't it be difficult for him to command the respect of the people of Viet-Nam in his new job?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I doubt whether our newspapers are circulated there as widely as they are here. [Laughter] I doubt that that would be a serious matter.

Q. Mrs. May Craig, Maine Papers: Mr. President, I am a little confused by your remark about Governor Dewey. We understood he urged you to run again. Do I understand you that he was urging on you the joys of private life? [Laughter]

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I read in the paper that he did a lot of urging. I must say that he may

have, I don't recall in detail. Now, he may have said something that was taken for granted. But he did describe, as I say, at great length the joys of private life, and certainly he didn't do it in any terms where he seemed to be failing to commend it to me. [Laughter]

Q. Edward T. Folliard, Washington Post and Times Herald: Mr. President, so I won't be fretting over this for a week-[laughter]--would you tell us what happened in June 1943? Was that the beginning of the boom?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I will tell you what happened. There was a man from the United States, a political figure, and I am not going to name him because he is still alive. We had just cleaned up northern Africa, and this man came in to me and said, "I hope you know that no American general can have a success of this scope and kind and fail to be considered for the Presidency," and I kicked him out of the office. [Laughter]

Merriman Smith, United Press: Thank you, Mr. President.

(11) Remarks at the Luncheon Meeting of the Association of American Colleges January 13, 1955

[The President spoke at the Statler Hotel, Washington, DC. His opening words referred to Rufus H. Fitzgerald, Chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh and President of the Association of American Colleges.]

EL-Dl6-30 (IR)

Mr. Chairman and President of this distinguished audience:

I must first acknowledge and insist that my appearance today is really an ex officio one, because I do not presume that my short adventure, pleasant though it was, in the educational field, gives me the right to be here to talk to you. But as President it is a most pleasant duty and a truly great privilege to be able, on behalf of the Administration--the United States Government-to welcome this body here, to assure you of the interest with which we follow your work both collectively and in your individual capacities.

As to a message of substance, I doubt that I can say anything that you have not heard, that you will not hear, and possibly that each of you already understands better than I. But it might be, nevertheless, of some significance that as the head of the Government charged with the responsibilities which were spoken of in the invocation, that by some simple statement I acknowledge clearly my appreciation of the importance of the work you people do--indeed, must do.

I am going to talk about education for a moment, not in its spiritual or its intellectual or its materialistic values and purposes. I want to talk about it, really, as a great cementing force by its promotion of understanding. For example, we have a clear comprehension that we need to strengthen the spiritual bases of our free institutions. We know, also, that we need as never before, experts, technicians in the sciences, people to conduct the research in every kind of discipline that applies to our material world. But it certainly takes understanding, a deeper comprehension, than a true knowledge of either of these factors of human existence, to know how to put them together.

How do you combine idealism and realism and never be guilty just of weak compromise? How do you establish for this nation great purposes, ideals that you are pursuing, and then manage other influences that come to bear and at least discolor or force a postponement of the achievement of those great ideals? How do you cooperate with others in the international field, certain that we have a great task of leadership to do? There we must realize that if we try to plant our own methods, our own concepts of man's dignity and worth instantly into another area, all we do is incur resistance, indeed enmity. How do we bring about understanding? We cannot be content merely with studying our own history and seeing how we have developed. We cannot be content with a mere study of the history of others so far as it affects us directly, or as they come in contact with us through wars or trade agreements.

We must understand their cultures, their histories, their aspirations, if we are to recognize-to be sympathetic even--to the decisions that they take that, sometimes now, are almost incomprehensible to us. The great masses of people--the two and a half billions of people that make up the population of the world--are never going to grow closer together unless there is a promotion of understanding. I think this is in a very large sense spiritual in character. Whence did we come? Why are we here? What is the true reason for our existence? And where are we going? For all of this, in the answers, we have the assistance--we have the faith--of the Christian ethic, or of our own particular religious convictions.

But others don't. Indeed, our greatest potential enemy in the world is the frank exponent of the doctrine of materialism, rejecting all of these values. This is the kind of thing, it seems to me, that educators must concern themselves with, just as seriously as they do with mathematics and engineering and research and theology. The common questions of humanity must be comprehended to meet--and it must be an integrated answer--to meet the crying needs of the human race in the twentieth century.

Now I have only haltingly and possibly very roughly sketched out an idea that I think will portray to you my appreciation of your work. Consequently, you know how earnest I am when I say I could not wish anybody greater success than I do you people. In our schools, in our churches, indeed in our Government, in everything we do, we must find a way to supplement the efforts of the home to develop Americans of understanding, of great spiritual beliefs, intellectual capacity, and unexcelled collective material strength, in a prosperity that is so widely shared that we all march forward together. That, is seems to me, is my rough idea of what I think you people have got to do, if the United States is going to attain that future that is surely hers by right and that, under God, she will attain.

Thank you very much.

(18) President's Press Conference January 19, 1955

EL-DI6-58 (PC)

[This is a complete transcript of the news conference of this date. Those portions of the President's replies which were not released for broadcasting or direct quotation at that time are enclosed in brackets.

[Television, newsreel, and newspaper camera equipment were present for the first time throughout a Presidential news conference. Candid photographs of the President were released.

Portions of the film and sound track were released for broadcast that night over television and radio and were available for newsreels. The release of portions of news conferences for radio, television, and newsreel use continued until May 18, when the practice of releasing the entire conference began.

[The broadcasting and newsreel release of excerpts of the news conferences led to a major change in their treatment in the press. Heretofore it had been customary to state the President's replies in indirect discourse only. Beginning with the January 19 conference, direct quotation was authorized for those portions of the transcript corresponding to the released tape and film. With the conference of May 18 direct quotation of the entire transcript began.]

THE PRESIDENT. Please be seated.

Well, I see we are trying a new experiment this morning. I hope it doesn't prove to be a disturbing influence. I have no announcements. We will go directly to questions.

Q. Robert E. Clark, International News Service: Mr. President, could you discuss the seriousness of the latest Communist attacks on Nationalist islands in the China Sea, in the light of our commitments to defend Formosa?

THE PRESIDENT. No military authority that I know of has tried to rate these small islands that are now under attack, or indeed the Tachens themselves, as an essential part of the defenses of Formosa and of the Pescadores, to the defense of which we are committed by the treaty that is now before the Senate for approval. The two islands, I believe, that have been under attack are not occupied by Chinese National regulars. They have been occupied by irregulars or guerrillas.

Now, the Tachens themselves are a different proposition. They are occupied by a division of troops. They are of value, there is no denying that, they are of value as an outpost, an additional point for observation. They are not a vital element, as we see it, in the defense of the islands. Exactly what is going to be the development there, I cannot foresee, so I won't try to speculate on exactly what we should do in that area. We don't even know, I think, at this moment--at least I wasn't informed this morning--what the Generalissimo's personal intentions are with respect to that particular region.

Q. Chalmers M. Roberts, Washington Post and Times Herald: Mr. President, in the light of this latest fight, would you consider that it would be useful to have a cease-fire between Communist China and Nationalist China if that could be arranged through the U.N. or by some other means?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I should like to see the U.N. attempt to exercise its good offices, I believe, because wherever there is any kind of fighting and open violence in the world, it is always sort of a powder keg. Whether the United Nations could do anything in this particular place, I don't know, because probably each side would insist that it was an internal affair; although from our viewpoint it might be a good thing to have them take a look at the problem.

Q. Merriman Smith, United Press: Mr. President, would it be possible for you, sir, to define or give us your impressions of Secretary Dulles' use of the word "forever" yesterday when he said that we would not wait forever for the release of our airmen by the Chinese Communists?

THE PRESIDENT. Well now, Mr. Smith, I didn't read the exact terms of his statement. I did not

and, therefore, I don't know the context in which he was speaking.I do know this: Mr. Dulles and I meet together more often, I think, than any other two individuals of this Government, at least in the Cabinet level, and we are in perfect accord as to our solution to these problems as they arise; so whatever he said, I am sure it was in keeping with the general policies and convictions he and I hold about this problem.

Q. Nat S. Finney, Buffalo News: Mr. President, in your state of the Union message, I believe you used the phrase "never to be forgotten men."

THE PRESIDENT. That is right.

Q. Mr. Finney: I wonder if you could give us a little better, a more complete insight as to what you had in mind in using that phrase?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, as long as there is an American unjustly imprisoned, I am going to continue to do my best to exert the influence that I think is available to us to secure his release, and to see that he gets justice. Now, let us never forget, ladies and gentlemen, that the lives of these individuals are at stake as well as some academic concept of the exact right in this thing. And let us not forget this either: our own knowledge of our purity of motive in the world is not always shared sometimes even by those we know to be our friends; and it is idle to say that there cannot be misunderstandings on the other side as to our motives and intentions and ideas. You will recall there were 25,000 prisoners escaped--North Koreans. They escaped into South Korea, and this created a very great difficulty at the time of the armistice negotiations. Now, we thought we were right, but what did the other side think? So you have these problems where we are certain that justice, decency, and right is on our side, but we also have the problem of convincing others that we are right and just and decent, and sometimes these things can create a lot of misapprehension and misunderstanding.

Q. Roscoe Drummond, New York Herald Tribune: Mr. President, do you think it is fair to conclude or do you conclude that the negotiations by Mr. Hammarskjold are a failure?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I would never admit failure to anything as long as it is going on. I have understood from his report that this was one step in negotiations that he expects to carry forward. He is meeting with the Secretary of State at 11:00 this morning, and I assume that we will have a little bit clearer understanding of exactly what he means. Now, the negotiations can never be a success until the Americans and allies unjustly held in China are returned to their homelands.On the other hand, they are certainly not a failure as long as they are going on. That would be just as incomprehensible as to admit defeat in a battle as long as you have got one man on the firing line. I never would admit that, so I don't think we are defeated there.

Q. Laurence H. Burd, Chicago Tribune: Mr. President, can you give us any idea what you would consider a reasonable time for the U.N. to negotiate for the return of these prisoners?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I don't think I could guess. I think that the time factor would always have to be related to any progress that you can see or feel or believe in. So, as long as a man of the character and standing of Hammarskjold believes that he is making progress, I think that you would have to wait; because, I repeat, there is here involved a question of lives of people as well as our rights, the common understanding of the facts in the case--there are numerous things that are involved, and I think he ought to have a full chance to do what he can.

Q. May Craig, Maine Papers: Mr. President, in view of the Communist violation of the Korean truce, what compliance could we expect from a U.N. truce in the Formosa Straits?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, maybe the best answer to that might be my saying that is a good question. [Laughter] But I think that is a problem forever in dealing with someone who shows a proclivity for acting like solemn agreements were scraps of paper, and it is what I think that we--Mr. Dulles and I--always mean when we say we want some confirmation in deeds, not just words. You will recall that in dealing with these questions in the past, when we have talked about the deeds that were necessary in the Far East, we have talked about withdrawal of troops in Korea that would remove the stigma placed upon Communist China by the United Nations in calling them an aggressor nation; in returning our prisoners; in abstaining from aggressive acts in Southeast Asia; in conducting itself as a civilized nation in the councils of the world. Now, you begin to understand what we mean by deeds that give some belief that we may have confidence in the agreements we draw up with them. What you are doing is voicing a doubt, and I must say that all of us share it.

Q. Sarah McClendon, El Paso Times: Mr. President, the Congressmen on Capitol Hill say that if they can find a copy of the budget to read that they can't understand it. [Laughter] Particularly, they say, the military budget is couched in such general terms that they can't find where the money is to be spent. Now, the justifications for these individual projects will go to two committees, appropriations committees, and not to the Members of Congress in general. Is there anything you can do to tell these people who have to vote on this where the money is to be spent?

THE PRESIDENT. [It is my understanding that is what the committees of Congress are for, and that is what the people that appear before those committees are for. [The national defense officials, from the Secretary on down to any level that the military committees and the appropriation committees want to call, will appear before them; and they will explain every single item in it. I can't be expected to take the details of a volume like that--I forget the number of pages--and explain that in detail to individuals anywhere.]

Q. Joseph A. Loftus, New York Times: Mr. President, will you comment on the proposal that Formosa and Red China be considered separate independent nations, and that there be an exchange of mutual security, and settle the problem that way?

THE PRESIDENT. [NO, I don't think I will comment on it for the simple reason that that commenting would make it appear that my convictions were finally formed in this area. [It is, of course, one of the possibilities that is constantly studied, but you can see that both sides to it might be very reluctant to have that proposal seriously considered.]

Q. John C. O'Brien, Philadelphia Inquirer: In your budget message you said you would not recommend an appropriation for the dredging of the upper channel of the Delaware River unless a cost-sharing plan was worked out. Now, some of the Congressmen from that area are pointing out that private industry has never before been assessed for a navigation project. Now, my question is: is this a new Government policy or are there special reasons for cost-sharing in the Delaware River project?

THE PRESIDENT. [Well, there are two things, I think: one is that I do believe that when the

Federal Government spends money that is mainly to the interests of the locality, we should find some way to make that locality participate. [I did not, by any manner of means, specify the method by which this partnership could be worked out. I suppose that the range of things that could be studied would be all the way from tolls, that is, from vessels actually using such a channel, to some direct participation in the original case. I do believe that we should, in these great projects, try to find a way that you get the local concern for economy or local benefits reflected in the appropriations the Federal Government makes. [Admittedly, let us say, this is to the general welfare of the whole Nation; and if it is a new policy, I think it should have been considered long ago myself.]

Q. Mr. O'Brien: Mr. President, the only new feature, I think, is the assessment on industry, local contributions, which are somewhat different.

THE PRESIDENT. [That is what I say: I do believe there ought to be some way of participation, and I wouldn't say that it couldn't be by tolls. I do say that I feel that there should be some local participation by those who are going to profit directly and in a major way in these things.]

Q. Marvin L. Arrowsmith, Associated Press: Mr. President, as tomorrow is the second anniversary of your inauguration, I wonder if you would care to give us an appraisal of your first 2 years, and tell us something of your hopes for the next 2 or maybe even the next 6. [Laughter]

THE PRESIDENT. It looks like a loaded question. [Laughter] Well, of course, I know of no way of evaluating the 2 years of this except to remind ourselves of certain things that have happened. I think I can say this without attempting to take either too much partisan credit or personal credit, because all of us realize that if these things have gone on, some of them have been participated in almost unanimously by both parties. But, let us without any further explanation just take a look: We were then fighting in Korea, and that war has been ended. Iran was in such situation that we weekly thought we had possibly lost it or we would see it going under Communist influence unreservedly and finally. There was a struggle going on between two of our friends, Britain and Egypt. The Trieste situation was upsetting all our relations in the Mediterranean, and bade fair to create really serious trouble in those countries, particularly in Italy. There was a growing difficulty in Central America, which finally flared up into the Guatemalan incident. And at that moment it looked like we were probably approaching close to defeat in our efforts to get any kind of agreement in Western Europe. Now, those things have been largely eliminated. In addition, I believe that we have been successful in convincing all of the countries of the Mid-East that we are desperately trying to be friends with everybody, trying to make friends between ourselves and each of the nations concerned. So I think that on the whole, in spite of a weakened situation in Indonesia [Indochina] and of the partial loss of Viet-Nam, that the foreign situation is more stable, generally speaking, looks better, and that is not by any means to say that it looks rosy. At home, we started out, you will recall, with a definite economic program. I am going to read one thing someone called to my attention this morning, because they said that I had been here 2 years. They pointed out that I said I was going to balance the budget quickly, and I want to read from the speech I made in Peoria, Illinois, October 2, 1952:

"A first and vital step is to eliminate the deficit from our national budget.

"Second, restore the incentive to expand production. A major step toward this end is to reduce Government spending and thereby permit lower taxation. Federal spending can be cut from the

present rate of $81 billion a year.

"My goal, assuming that the cold war gets no worse, is to cut Federal spending to something like $60 billion within 4 years. Such a cut would eliminate the deficit in the budget."

Now, of course, you have seen the recent budget, and its estimate that there will still be a $2,400,000,000 deficit; but the budget itself, by coincidence, is $62,400,000,000, so I almost can claim credit for being a prophet. If there could be found some way of eliminating that $2,400,000,000, why, it would look like it would be in balance. Now, in addition to that, controls have been removed from our economy. There has been a new farm program set up which we have every reason to believe will bring about a better balance between production and markets. We have brought about the transition from a war economy to a peace economy with, I think, almost an unprecedented easing of the situation and its impact upon our people and their several occupations and businesses. There has been a reduction in taxes that is unprecedented for any single year in our history. Now, along with that, we come to the moment, and we look ahead. We have an expanding economy. We have an economy and an industry, financial situation, that reflects the confidence and hope of our people, the belief of our people. Now, I am not saying that the stock market itself, its rises and falls, is necessarily an index of what is going to happen in this country; but it does reflect that kind of confidence that we have tried in the past so hard to instill. There is a greater production of houses in our country today than ever before in our history. We are even higher today than we were in 1953. All the way along, consumer spending is going up, consumer savings are going up. There is, of course, not a wholly satisfactory picture. There are industries in particular areas where there are still difficulties. We are working on them. But the outlook, certainly from the standpoint of our internal economy, is good. I know of no better measure, if I may conclude here, Mr. Arrowsmith, than to say: how do people feel today as to the way they felt then?

Q. Clark R. Mollenhoff, Des Moines Register and Tribune: Mr. President, last week you told us that Secretary Benson had given you a one-sided version of this Ladejinsky case, and at that time you indicated that you personally could not look into all of these cases. I wondered if, in light of that, you could tell us if you have any mechanism set up in the White House to protect yourself against misinformation or half information from Cabinet officers or other individuals, the types of thing that led Mr.Truman and Mr. Harding in so much trouble.

THE PRESIDENT. I think you are a little bit unfair in your interpretation of exactly what I said. I didn't say he deliberately gave me a one-sided picture. I said he gave me a memorandum of the facts, as he saw them; and the facts as he saw them, I said, would have disturbed me very badly. Now, I also said that I trust the judgment of the people that I put in these important administrative positions. In spite of the fact that in this case two of these people have reached different conclusions, I believe that each has exercised his own judgment honestly; and I am not going to take unto myself making an investigation in this area, I assure you.

Q. Mr. Mollenhoff: Mr. President, I understood that you--backed them in their right to make different judgments--

THE PRESIDENT. That is right.

Q. Mr. Mollenhoff: on these things. I wondered, though, if you would feel there was something

you should step in on where there was a difference on fact, as in a serious situation where one department would say a man was a member of two Communist front organizations, and the other department would make a flat statement that he was not?

THE PRESIDENT. [Well, what we had here, of course, was a simple thing. This was a case where the heads of two principal departments were involved, and they reached different conclusions. [Normally, and under the orders that have been issued, it is expected that each individual, each head of department, will in his own field exercise his judgment; and that created rather a paradox. [Now, arrangements have been made that when two departments reach different conclusions on these things, there will be coordination.]

Q. Robert J. Donovan, New York Herald Tribune: Mr. President, is that something new that you are telling us here now?

THE PRESIDENT. [NO, I think it is not really new. I think it is a precautionary admonition, you might say, a piece of advice because it should be normal procedure in a well-run organization, and possibly it was overlooked here.]

Q. Mr. Donovan: May I rephrase this question just once more?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Q. Mr. Donovan: Are there any specific new changes or studies in prospect in this matter?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, Mr. Donovan, I told you people several times I know of nothing that is engaging more attention all the time. I have told you of the special department set up in the Attorney General's Office to which all the troublesome, particularly troublesome, matters can be referred for advice and counsel and, particularly, to which can be referred any case where there are differing views. There has also been initiated by other groups--I believe by a university group in one case, I believe by the New York Bar Association-certain inquiries into these things. I assure you they will be assisted in the making of their inquiries into policy or into programs; they are not attempting to be judges in particular cases.

Q. Edward T. Folliard, Washington Post and Times Herald: Mr. President, to go back to the fighting in the Far East for a moment, the dispatches from Formosa say that the Chinese Reds may now storm the other islands off the coast, including the Tachens. A United Press story from Formosa says there is an American detachment on one of the Tachen Islands.If we may assume that that story is correct, would we leave that American detachment on any of those islands, in view of the fact that they may be attacked by the Chinese Reds?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I would have to ask the commander on the spot what orders these individuals are under; whether they are still there or not, I don't know. Most of these units--[confers with Mr. Hagerty]--well, I think that is a technicality. The fact is that I assume the commander has given his instructions under different circumstances as to what will occur, and it hasn't been brought to my attention; but Mr. Hagerty does say there are four or five men on one of the islands, I think.

Q. John Herling, Editors Syndicate: Mr. President, Secretary of Labor Mitchell has recommended to you that a career servant, Ewan Clague, be renominated as Commissioner of

Labor Statistics, and that recommendation has been in the White House for several months. I wonder whether you have any knowledge of the situation?

THE PRESIDENT. [I will have to look it up. I don't recall the name.]

Q. Mr. Herling: Ewan Clague is the incumbent Commissioner.

THE PRESIDENT. [I don't recall the name; I will have to look it up.]

Q. Mr. Herling: Thank you, sir.

Q. William Theis, International News Service: Yesterday Secretary Wilson said he would favor nonstrategic trade with the Communist bloc countries. Does that bear your considered approval, or can you comment further on it?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, it certainly could not be said to carry my considered approval, although the subject, of course, has been discussed in this Government, in Congress, since--well, for 2 years. There are two points, I think, that it is well to remember about trade: one, that trade is a process that takes place between two nations or two groups and, presumably, for the economic benefit of both. If you trade something to me, you think that you are getting the benefit of the trade, and I think I am getting it. But there is also this: trade is one of the greatest influences in the hands of the diplomat; and how he uses it, negatively or positively or in roundabout methods even, it is an influence to bring about and carry out the policies under which that country is operating. Now, our policy is simple--to promote peaceful relationships in the world; and I would say we would never with anyone carry on trade unless we thought that that cause were gaining. Certainly under present conditions we do have complete embargoes with respect to certain countries, and so just some casual statement of that kind would not change our policy.

Q. Merriman Smith, United Press: Mr. President, when you referred, you said arrangements had been made that when two departments reached different conclusions on security cases, that there will be coordination. Could you tell us who does the coordinating? Are you referring to the unit in the Justice Department--

THE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Q. Mr. Smith: -- or does the White House--

THE PRESIDENT. That is correct. I have asked them in each case, before that case would have to be referred to me, that they first meet with this individual and try to accomplish that coordination. Of course, I think if a similar case to the one to which you referred occurred in the future, and it couldn't be settled, well, they would bring it to me; but then there would be a complete report of investigation on both sides.

Q. Alice A. Dunnigan, Associated Negro Press: Mr. President, will the Government continue to permit naval vessels to visit ports where the crews must submit to segregation, racial segregation, as happened when the carrier Midway visited Capetown, South Africa, recently?

THE PRESIDENT. [You will have to go and ask the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Navy, one of the two. [What I know about that case has been brought to me by showing me a

clipping out of the newspaper, and I don't know anything about it.]

Q. Martin S. Hayden, Detroit News: Mr. President, in your state of the Union message you promised or indicated there would be a positive Federal program to aid the construction of schools, but in the budget message we couldn't find any money for it. Will there be some actual expenditures?

THE PRESIDENT. Remember this, there has to be a new authorization in that regard. Now, there is a plan from Mrs. Hobby's office going to the Congress on 15 February. Remember this: there is a White House Conference called for November. It is a very broad educational conference, and nobody in this administration is going to get in the way of the findings of that to the extent of, let's say, vitiating the recommendations or trying to anticipate them. But what we are trying to do now, recognizing the acute shortage of schoolrooms, is to find a method of helping and assisting States and localities and districts to get this thing on the rails, knowing that we can't possibly in this way damage anything that will be done by this conference.

Q. John D. Morris, New York Times: A moment ago you read from a speech in which you outlined a 4-year program for balancing the budget.

THE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Q. Mr. Morris: I believe about 3 of those are up now. Could you say that is a promise to balance that next year?

THE PRESIDENT. [I thought someone had reminded me I had been here 2 years.]

Q. Mr. Morris: Well, this is the third budget, I believe, sir.

THE PRESIDENT. [Oh, no. The first budget had been prepared. [We have been here 2 years, let's don't try to push me too hard.] [Laughter]

Q. Edward Milne, Providence Evening Bulletin: Mr. President, I would like to know, sir, your reaction to former Senator Harry Cain's strong criticism over the weekend of these employee security programs.

THE PRESIDENT. [Well, Mr. Cain, like everybody else, has his right to criticize. [Again I say the system that he criticizes, I believe, is fairly well conceived. Certainly it is the best that we have been able to devise in view of the conflicting considerations that apply. And they are also sensitive considerations, sensitive on the side of the Government and sensitive on the side of the individual. In their application always there is human failure; I admit that, and I don't claim any kind of perfection. [Now, so far as I know, Mr. Cain has not submitted to any responsible official in the executive department a summary of his objections or on what he bases his criticism. I did read part of his speech, and that is all I know about it.]

Q. Andrew F. Tully, Jr., Scripps-Howard: Mr. President, after 2 years in office, how do you like your job? [Laughter]

THE PRESIDENT. I don't think I will try to answer that one. Like everything else, there are not wholly unmixed blessings in such duties and responsibilities.

Merriman Smith, United Press: Thank you, Mr. President.

(21) Special Message to Congress Regarding U. S. Policy for the Defense of Formosa January 24, 1955

EL-Dl6-52 (RA)

To the Congress of the United States:

The most important objective of our nation's foreign policy is to safeguard the security of the United States by establishing and preserving a just and honorable peace. In the Western Pacific, a situation is developing in the Formosa Straits, that seriously imperils the peace and our security.

Since the end of Japanese hostilities in 1945, Formosa and the Pescadores have been in the friendly hands of our loyal ally, the Republic of China. We have recognized that it was important that these islands should remain in friendly hands. In unfriendly hands, Formosa and the Pescadores would seriously dislocate the existing, even if unstable, balance of moral, economic and military forces upon which the peace of the Pacific depends. It would create a breach in the island chain of the Western Pacific that constitutes, for the United States and other free nations, the geographical backbone of their security structure in that Ocean. In addition, this breach would interrupt North-South communications between other important elements of that barrier, and damage the economic life of countries friendly to us.

The United States and the friendly Government of the Republic of China, and indeed all the free nations, have a common interest that Formosa and the Pescadores should not fall into the control of aggressive Communist forces. Influenced by such considerations, our government was prompt, when the Communists committed armed aggression in Korea in June 1950, to direct our Seventh Fleet to defend Formosa from possible invasion from the Communist mainland.

These considerations are still valid. The Seventh Fleet continues under Presidential directive to carry out that defensive mission. We also provide military and economic support to the Chinese Nationalist Government and we cooperate in every proper and feasible way with that Government in order to promote its security and stability. All of these military and related activities will be continued.

In addition, there was signed last December a Mutual Defense Treaty between this Government and the Republic of China covering Formosa and the neighboring Pescadores. It is a treaty of purely defensive character. That Treaty is now before the Senate of the United States. Meanwhile Communist China has pursued a series of provocative political and military actions, establishing a pattern of aggressive purpose. That purpose, they proclaim, is the conquest of Formosa.

In September 1954 the Chinese Communists opened up heavy artillery fire upon Quemoy island, one of the natural approaches to Formosa, which had for several years been under the uncontested control of the Republic of China. Then came air attacks of mounting intensity against other free China islands, notably those in the vicinity of the Tachen group to the north of Formosa. One small island (Ichiang) was seized last week by air and amphibious operations after a gallant few fought bravely for days against overwhelming odds. There have been recent heavy air attacks and artillery fire against the main Tachen Islands themselves.

The Chinese Communists themselves assert that these attacks are a prelude to the conquest of Formosa. For example, after the fall of Ichiang, the Peiping Radio said that it showed a "determined will to fight for the liberation of Taiwan (Formosa). Our people will use all their strength to fulfill that task."

Clearly, this existing and developing situation poses a serious danger to the security of our country and of the entire Pacific area and indeed to the peace of the world. We believe that the situation is one for appropriate action of the United Nations under its charter, for the purpose of ending the present hostilities in that area. We would welcome assumption of such jurisdiction by that body.

Meanwhile, the situation has become sufficiently critical to impel me, without awaiting action by the United Nations, to ask the Congress to participate now, by specific resolution, in measures designed to improve the prospects for peace. These measures would contemplate the use of the armed forces of the United States if necessary to assure the security of Formosa and the Pescadores.

The actions that the United States must be ready to undertake are of various kinds. For example, we must be ready to assist the Republic of China to redeploy and consolidate its forces if it should so desire. Some of these forces are scattered throughout the smaller off-shore islands as a result of historical rather than military reasons directly related to defending Formosa. Because of the air situation in the area, withdrawals for the purpose of redeployment of Chinese Nationalist forces would be impractical without assistance of the armed forces of the United States. Moreover, we must be alert to any concentration or employment of Chinese Communist forces obviously undertaken to facilitate attack upon Formosa, and be prepared to take appropriate military action.

I do not suggest that the United States enlarge its defensive obligations beyond Formosa and the Pescadores as provided by the Treaty now awaiting ratification. But unhappily, the danger of armed attack directed against that area compels us to take into account closely related localities and actions which, under current conditions, might determine the failure or the success of such an attack. The authority that may be accorded by the Congress would be used only in situations which are recognizable as parts of, or definite preliminaries to, an attack against the main positions of Formosa and the Pescadores.

Authority for some of the actions which might be required would be inherent in the authority of the Commander-in-Chief. Until Congress can act I would not hesitate, so far as my Constitutional powers extend, to take whatever emergency action might be forced upon us in order to protect the rights and security of the United States.

However, a suitable Congressional resolution would clearly and publicly establish the authority of the President as Commander-in-Chief to employ the armed forces of this nation promptly and effectively for the purposes indicated if in his judgment it became necessary. It would make clear the unified and serious intentions of our Government, our Congress and our people. Thus it will reduce the possibility that the Chinese Communists, misjudging our firm purpose and national unity, might be disposed to challenge the position of the United States, and precipitate a major crisis which even they would neither anticipate nor desire.

In the interest of peace, therefore, the United States must remove any doubt regarding our readiness to fight, if necessary, to preserve the vital stake of the free world in a free Formosa, and to engage in whatever operations may be required to carry out that purpose.

To make this plain requires not only Presidential action but also Congressional action. In a situation such as now confronts us, and under modern conditions of warfare, it would not be prudent to await the emergency before coming to the Congress. Then it might be too late. Already the warning signals are flying.

I believe that the threatening aspects of the present situation, if resolutely faced, may be temporary in character. Consequently, I recommend that the Resolution expire as soon as the President is able to report to the Congress that the peace and security of the area are reasonably assured by international conditions, resulting from United Nations action or otherwise.

Again I say that we would welcome action by the United Nations which might, in fact, bring an end to the active hostilities in the area. This critical situation has been created by the choice of the Chinese Communists, not by us. Their offensive military intent has been flaunted to the whole world by words and by deeds. Just as they created the situation, so they can end it if they so choose.

What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy. Consequently, my recommendations do not call for an increase in the armed forces of the United States or any acceleration in military procurement or levels of defense production. If any unforeseen emergency arises requiring any change, I will communicate with the Congress. I hope, however, that the effect of an appropriate Congressional Resolution will be to calm the situation rather than to create further conflict.

One final point. The action I request is, of course, no substitute for the Treaty with the Republic of China which we have signed and which I have transmitted to the Senate. Indeed, present circumstances make it more than ever important that this basic agreement should be promptly brought into force, as a solemn evidence of our determination to stand fast in the agreed Treaty area and to thwart all attacks directed against it. If delay should make us appear indecisive in this basic respect, the pressures and dangers would surely mount.

Our purpose is peace. That cause will be served if, with your help, we demonstrate our unity and our determination. In all that we do we shall remain faithful to our obligations as a member of the United Nations to be ready to settle our international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.

For the reasons outlined in this message, I respectfully request that the Congress take appropriate action to carry out the recommendations contained herein.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

(22) Remarks on Receiving Statue Presented by Ambassador Krekeler on Behalf of the German People January 25, 1955

[The President spoke at the Natural History Building of the Smithsonian Institution, following the presentation by the German Ambassador of a bronze statue, "Laboring

Youth". The President's opening words "Mr. Ambassador, Mr Carmichael" referred to Dr. Heinz L. Krekeler, Ambassador from Germany, and Leonard Carmichael Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution..]

EL-Dl6-3O (IR)

Mr. Ambassador, Mr. Carmichael, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is indeed a great privilege to speak for the American people in accepting from the German people this product of a German artist and a gift of that entire nation.

We know that twice in our generation our two countries have been at war. What this gift symbolizes in a revolution of thinking--in the erasing of old enmities and a desire to cooperate among ourselves for the peaceful advancement of all nations is going to be meaningful as long as this statue, this work of art, endures.

I think, for myself, I have a particular additional item of satisfaction in that I was, after all, the commander of the great forces from the West that swept over Germany in the most recent war. The fact that I am now privileged as the representative of our country to accept this, with feelings and mutual expressions of peaceful intent and purpose, is something that is very dear to me at this moment.

I hope, Mr. Ambassador, that you will express to President Heuss, and through him to all the people of Germany, the very great satisfaction we shall take in this, not only for its own sake as a great work of art, but because of what it symbolizes in the efforts that both nations and both peoples are now making to do our best to make this a peaceful world.

Thank you very much.

The following letter from President Heuss, dated December 10, 1954, was read during the ceremonies by Ambassador Krekeler:

Mr. President:

During the years of Germany's deepest despair countless men and women in countries both near and far sent us gifts expressing their warmth of heart. These acts of humanity saved the lives of many Germans. Men and women, broken and exhausted, drew from them renewed courage to face life.

Among the nations who have helped in great-hearted fashion to mitigate the suffering in Germany, the United States of America occupies the foremost position. Numerous societies and organizations in your country have placed themselves in the service of brotherly love in a truly imposing effort that stands forth unrivalled in our time. Over and above this, innumerable American citizens have untiringly lent their aid by privately sending charitable gifts of every kind. Even today this flow of gifts from the United States has not spent itself and helps countless suffering human beings in Germany, especially refugees and expellees who are still obliged to live in camps, to preserve their faith in a better future.

The German people cannot repay the debt of gratitude which accumulated during their years of anguish, but they can acknowledge it and attempt to make it manifest. This is to be done by

means of art works created by our people and in many cases by men and women who themselves live in hard-pressed circumstances. All of my countrymen have gladly contributed to making these art works available in order that they may serve as symbols of their gratitude. Through these monuments we hope to find our way to the unknown benefactors in your country, so that each and every one of them will know that we have not forgotten his great-hearted act.

I ask your Excellency to accept this sculpture of a kneeling man by the sculptor Hermann Blumenthal as a modest token of the heartfelt gratitude which we bear to the people of the United States of America.

It is with pleasure, Mr. President, that I avail myself of this opportunity to assure you of my highest esteem.

THEODOR HEUSS

(27) Message Recorded for the New York USO Defense Fund Dinner January 28, 1955 aired February 3, 1955 [The dinner was held at the Sheraton-Astor Hotel, New York City.]

EL-Dl6-30 (IR)

My fellow Americans:

I welcome this opportunity to express my thanks and appreciation to all those of you, who, despite busy lives, never relax your efforts in backing up and helping the men and women in our Armed Services.

Today, we have the largest military establishment in our peacetime history. Men and women of that establishment are standing guard for us in many outposts of the world. In every kind of circumstance and condition they are performing onerous duties that the rest of us may enjoy security. But--and we thank God when we say it--young Americans are not exposed to gunfire today.

So, to some it may seem that special civilian attention to the morale of our Armed Services is no longer important. In fact, however, among troops in foreign stations it is often more difficult to maintain morale during peace than during war. Loneliness, all the penalties of separation from home, are far sharper then.

I know what the USO means to our Service personnel. More than just a Camp Show or a chance for an hour's diversion, more than just relaxation or warm hospitality, it means to the men and women in the Armed Services that they have a host of friends in the homes of America. No matter what part of the country a serviceman comes from, no matter what his race or religion, he wants to feel confident that what he is doing is important to other human beings, and that they are grateful for it.

Such assurance fortifies spirit and morale, strengthens the ties in heart and mind which unite the individual serviceman with his fellow citizens, which make him feel that he is part of America! He must have such assurance, if he is willingly and ably to perform the vitally important duties which our times and our nation's good demand of him.

I hope that people throughout America will be reminded of this fact through the work of the

USO and the other United Defense Fund groups. This work must go forward, for the happiness of the individual man and woman in our Armed Services, for the furtherance of our country's security.

I congratulate all of you on your willingness to take an active part in this endeavor, and I wish you the fullest possible success.

(24) Statement by the President Upon Signing the Joint Resolution on the Defense of Formosa January 29, 1955

[As adopted, the Joint Resolution is Public Law 4, 84th Congress (69 Stat. 7). Two days earlier, the White House announced that following a meeting of the National Security Council the President met with top Defense Department and military advisers to discuss the deployment of United States air and naval forces in the Formosa area. At that meeting, the release stated, the President made it clear that these forces were designed purely for defensive purposes and that any decision to use United States forces other than in immediate self-defense or in direct defense of Formosa and the Pescadores would be a decision which he would take and the responsibility for which he had not delegated.]

EL-Dl6-30 (IR)

I AM deeply gratified at the almost unanimous vote in the Congress of the United States on this joint resolution. To the members of the Congress and to their leaders with me here today I wish publicly to thank them for their great patriotic service.

By their vote, the American people through their elected representatives have made it clear to the world that we are united here at home in our determination to help a brave ally and to resist Communist armed aggression.

By so asserting this belief we are taking a step to preserve the peace in the Formosa area. We are ready to support a United Nations effort to end the present hostilities in the area, but we also are united in our determination to defend an area vital to the security of the United States and the free world.

(26) President's Press Conference February 2, 1955 [President Eisenhower's fifty-ninth news conference was held in the Executive Office Building from 10:33 to ll:0lam, in attendance: 194.]

EL-Dl6-59 (PC)

[This is a complete transcript of the news conference of this date. Those portions of the President's replies which were not released for broadcasting or direct quotation at that time are enclosed in brackets.]

THE PRESIDENT. Good morning; please sit down.

I have no announcements. We will go right to questions.

Q. Merriman Smith, United Press: Mr. President, have you had any indication from Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek that he wants a public statement or some form of assurance from

you or this Government that we consider Quemoy and Matsu part of the defense of Formosa?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, there are constantly, of course, conversations going on between our representatives and the Chinese Nationalists, and not always do our views exactly coincide; but I think that in view of the delicacy of this whole situation, one that in its main parts is before the United Nations, it is better to stand for the moment just on what we have said, at least publicly, let it go at that, and say no more for the moment.

Q. David P. Sentner, Hearst Newspapers: Mr. President, if I might presume to ask a question on the fringe of the situation, in Moscow a few days ago, Foreign Minister Molotov gave an interview to W. R. Hearst, Jr., and Kingsbury Smith of International News Service, and he indicated that the Soviet Government would be willing to take up with the Chinese Communist Government the question of a temporary cease-fire for the evacuation of the Tachens, if the United States made a request of the Kremlin for such a step. Now, is there any communication on that subject or relating to it, under consideration?

THE PRESIDENT. First of all, I know nothing about that, but I do call attention to this: that it's the Chinese Nationalists that are occupying the Tachens and not the United States, and if there were any such request, I don't see how the United States could make it unilaterally.

Q. Alan S. Emory, Watertown Times: Mr. President, Senator Humphrey of Minnesota has introduced a resolution that would put Congress on record as backing U.N. efforts to reach a cease-fire in the Formosa controversy. Senator George, the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, says he thinks the administration favors such a plan, and he knows he does, and he thinks it would meet the approval of the American people. Senator Knowland says that such resolution might constitute a blanket endorsement of appeasement. I wondered how you felt about that, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. [I haven't thought about it; and I suppose that here you have personalities reflecting their own convictions about such things. [Any answer I give you now would be so much of a shotgun opinion I would rather think that one over. I had not noticed that before.]

Q. Mr. Emory: Well, sir--

THE PRESIDENT. [I really have nothing more to say about it.] Q. Chalmers M. Roberts, Washington Post and Times Herald: Mr. President, could you enlighten us, sir, as to whether the 7th Fleet is under orders which include the doctrine of "hot pursuit" in case our planes or ships are attacked by Communist planes?

THE PRESIDENT. Frankly, I considered whether I would talk about such things this morning. And I repeat what I have said, I don't believe it is best to put out any specific blueprint on orders or instructions. I believe it is just best to leave it as it stands at the moment. The United Nations is working on this, and I don't see how any statement of mine could do anything more than muddy the water. Now, this is not any attempt to keep either you people or the American people in the dark, but this is an international situation. There is every kind of influence and crosscurrent involved, and I just think it is wise to say nothing.

Q. Richard L. Wilson, Cowles Publications: Mr. President, in spite of assurances which you have given, and in spite of statements which have been made in Congress, I think there is still a great

deal of uneasiness in the country with respect to whether your policy will lead to fighting in the Far East. Could you discuss that subject again?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, certainly this: the purpose is to make certain that no conflict occurs through mistaken calculations on the other side as to our concern about Formosa and our determination to defend it. We have been as exact as it seems possible to be, and we have certainly tried to avoid being truculent. The purpose is honestly and hopefully to prevent war.

Q. Jack Norman, Fairchild Publications: Mr. President, there is talk now on Capitol Hill that there might have to be some compromises to get the reciprocal trade legislation through Congress; and I wanted to ask you, if it comes to a choice, would you give up your minimum wage recommendations or something else to get H.R. I through in its present form?

THE PRESIDENT. [Well, I don't see the relationship.]

Q. Mr. Norman: Well, some of the witnesses yesterday before the Ways and Means Committee were making the point, there is no point in hiking the minimum wage if we are going to lower the tariffs.

THE PRESIDENT. [So far as I am concerned, on both these points, I have expressed my recommendations. [Now, as usual, I have to wait to see what Congress does; I couldn't predict in any degree whatsoever what would be my action thereafter.]

Q. Marvin Arrowsmith, Associated Press: Mr. President, General Ridgway told the House Armed Services Committee 2 days ago that he is against the projected cut in Army strength, and he said he believes that the proposed cut jeopardized national security to a degree. How do you feel about that, and is there any possibility of the reduction order being rescinded ?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I assume that you are asking me the question so far as it affects the executive department. My decision in this matter was not reached lightly; it was reached after long study of every opinion I could get, in consultation with every single individual in this Government that I know of that bears any responsibility whatsoever about it. General Ridgway was questioned in the Congress as to his personal convictions; naturally, he had to express them. His responsibility for national defense is, you might say, a special one, or, in a sense, parochial. He does not have the overall responsibility that is borne by the Commander in Chief, and by him alone, when it comes down to making the recommendations to the Congress. My recommendations, I repeat, were made from my best judgment of what is the adequate defense structure for these United States, particularly on the long-term basis. That decision has not been altered, and at this moment I don't see any chance of its being altered.

Q. Sarah McClendon, El Paso Times: Mr. President, in that same connection, your letter of January 5th to Mr. Wilson, I believe, mentioned that recent scientific and technological developments made it necessary for us not to use as many men as we might otherwise use. Well, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in their testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, don't agree with this. They say, no. Will you have any further conferences with them on this?

THE PRESIDENT. I confer with the Joint Chiefs of Staff through their chairman several times a week, every week. I am never out of touch with them. I know their opinions, and I know exactly who agrees with me and who doesn't. Now, they are entitled to their opinions, but I have to make

the decisions.

Q. Lloyd M. Schwartz, Fairchild Publications: I would like to ask a question about procurement policy.

THE PRESIDENT. Procurement?

Q. Mr. Schwartz: Some manufacturers of silk cartridge cloths, which are vital to the defense program, say they have protested to you the award of contracts by the Army to manufacturers using yarns spun abroad, and they claim this endangers the mobilization base. I wondered whether you were considering that and, perhaps, some change in the regulations?

THE PRESIDENT. [I have no doubt, if they say that, that they have submitted the recommendation. If so, it has unquestionably been routed, as it would normally be, to the proper people. I have not personally seen it, so I couldn't comment on it.]

Q. Raymond P. Brandt, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: Several weeks ago you said you were going to consult with the Democratic leaders in Congress, and you had not decided on the mechanism. Have the Cabinet officers consulted the Democratic leaders on legislation going up? And the reason I ask, there are two points: one is on your road program; two is on the cut in the Army.

THE PRESIDENT. I have personally talked to them about the structure of the Defense Establishment that I would recommend for this year, and as a long-term program. I personally did that. Now, unquestionably, the Secretary of Defense and his people are in touch with them constantly. As to the road program, I can't answer specifically except that I know the Secretary of the Treasury has at least talked with Senator Byrd to some extent about financing it.

Q. Mr. Brandt: The reason I asked is, when these messages go up or when the announcements were made, we get adverse comments from the Hill from the Democrats.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I don't mean to say that everything we send up is agreed to in advance by the leaders of the other side. As far as I know, we are certainly trying to avoid springing something on them that we know about. Again, I suppose, errors certainly can occur; but the purpose is to keep them informed of what is coming up.

Q. A. E. Salpeter, Haaretz (Tel Aviv): Going back to Formosa, it seems since the cease-fire, by nature, is a temporary arrangement, do you foresee the possibility of a permanent peaceful relationship between Formosa and the Red China regime?

THE PRESIDENT. [I just don't know. I think that only time will tell. It is something that we must take a step at a time and try to make advancement toward conditions that will promote peace.]

Q. Harry W. Frantz, United Press, South American Service: The Foreign Minister of Venezuela, in connection with the Formosan situation, has made a statement of friendship, moral and economic support toward the United States, which later was generally republished by the American Chamber of Commerce in Venezuela. If that has come to your attention, would you care to comment?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, it hadn't come to my attention. Of course, our hope is that through the

Organization of Pan American States our general attitude toward this whole business of promoting peace and friendly relations in the world will have a solid foundation and agreement among our own American States. That is, I should say, one of the cornerstones of American policy.

Q. Robert G. Spivack, New York Post: Mr. President, the charge has been made that the censorship of the record of these press conferences before they are released to TV and radio means that only exchanges favorable to the administration and the Republican Party would be issued. Would you care to comment on that censorship?

THE PRESIDENT. I think that that is an item you can talk over with my technician, who is Mr. Hagerty. [Laughter] I believe someone told me that for one of the press conferences we had, 28 minutes of it was released; I couldn't think there could be much room for censorship there.

Q. Clark R. Mollenhoff, Des Moines Register: Mr. President, both your Justice Department and Civil Service Commission have stated that they have advisory functions in coordinating your security program. However, they both state that their functions are purely advisory, and that they can't go beyond that in the event that some department head would want to disregard their advice. In the light of that, I wondered what recourse there is in the administration for an employee who might have a security risk tag put on him by one department, and other departments might hold that he was not a security risk?

THE PRESIDENT. [Of course, it is understood that if two department heads differ on any subject--whether it is security, whether it is anything else that involves this Government--if that cannot be settled between them eventually, it must come to me; that is inherent in organization, and it is inherent in this problem.]

Q. Mr. Mollenhoff: Mr. President, I wondered if the individual cases, as such--though I was thinking in terms of the employee in this case who might have this security risk tag tied on him, and that would be rather serious in his eyes--and would he have any recourse though, could he come to you personally, was that what you meant?

THE PRESIDENT. [No, I don't think that he would come to me personally. I think the problem would. As quickly as two departments differ on anything, it must come to me if not settled otherwise.]

Q. Mr. Mollenhoff: All of those cases that are pending, then, will eventually be brought in?

THE PRESIDENT. [As a matter of fact, I have heard only of one case where two different departments were involved; I could be wrong. There may be more.]

Q. Mr. Mollenhoff: I wondered if in that case that would eventually be decided by that--

THE PRESIDENT. [That one would have, except that someone had taken it over. We agreed that each of them followed their own best judgment, the man was rehired, and it was a fait accompli. Of course, I didn't come into it, because it was done. And I approved it.]

Q. Nat S. Finney, Buffalo Evening News: Mr. President, do you have any plans to withdraw the Dixon-Yates contract?

THE PRESIDENT. I do not.

Q. Ethel Payne, Defender Publications: Sir, I wonder if you would care to comment on the coming Asian-African conference, and if you could--

THE PRESIDENT. Would I comment on what? I couldn't hear you.

Q. Miss Payne: The coming Asian-African conference; and could you tell us if we are going to send observers to that conference?

THE PRESIDENT. [As a matter of fact, I am not certain as to detail. Of course, any conference of that kind we follow with the greatest of interest,[1] but I don't even know whether we have been invited to send observers. It is a question you would have to ask the State Department; I am really not up on it.]

1On April 17, the White House released a statement by the Secretary of State following a meeting with the President in Augusta, Ca., at which time they discussed the Asian-African conference then opening in Bandung. Secretary Dulles noted that the President "expressed the hope that it will heed the universal longing of the peoples of the world for peace and that it will seek a renunciation of force to achieve national ambitions. The President hailed the Bandung Conference as providing an opportunity, at a critical hour, to voice the peaceful aspirations of the peoples of the world and thus exert a practical influence for peace where peace is now in grave jeopardy."

Q. Donald Irwin, New York Herald Tribune: Mr. President, it is nearly 3 months since you sent Judge Harlan's nomination to the Senate, and the Judiciary Committee has put off hearings until the 23d of February; and I wondered if you had any comment.

THE PRESIDENT. None, except that I continue to believe that Judge Harlan's qualifications for that post are of the highest; certainly they were the highest of any that I could find.

Q. Benjamin R. Cole, Indianapolis Star: Mr. President, could you tell us, sir, your feelings about the FHA cleanup? Is that nearly completed, sir, or do you feel that there is still more to be done there?

THE PRESIDENT. [I haven't had a report on it in the last couple of weeks. There was a report then that they hoped they were getting down to the final action in the case. I would hope so, because I personally think that FHA, and confidence in FHA, is of the utmost importance to the United States. So I would hope we get this cleaned up and really back to where it belongs in the respect of our people.]

Q. Frank van der Linden, Nashville Banner: Mr. President, in your budget message regarding TVA, you raised the possibility of some new method of financing the TVA steam plants. Would that include the issuance of bonds by TVA itself?

THE PRESIDENT. [I think there are a number of methods, but I would have to wait on the TVA recommendations. That is one reason for the appointment as the head of TVA of a man in whom I have the utmost confidence, his disinterest in this, studying what is the public, the national good, in the premises; so I would have to wait on their recommendations.]

Q. Mr. van der Linden: Sir, do you plan to submit a recommendation to Congress later, then?

THE PRESIDENT. [I don't, unless I can get something from him.]

Q. Roscoe Drummond, New York Herald Tribune: Mr. President, may I ask a further question about Judge Harlan? Do you think there is an inordinate delay in holding the hearings on Judge Harlan, and do you think that this delay could conceivably harm the functioning of the Court itself?

THE PRESIDENT. Report was made to me that the members of the Court naturally wanted to have a full Court as early as they could. So I moved as rapidly as I could to find a proper individual and recommended him to the Congress after the vacancy occurred as fast as I could. Now, I think it is too bad that the delay seems to be necessary in the eyes of the committee; but on the other hand, I, as usual, don't intend to stand up and publicly criticize Congress for what it does. I personally think it is unfortunate that this delay has to occur.

Q. Mrs. May Craig, Maine Papers: Mr. President, have you reached any conclusion on revision of the United Nations Charter, which can be done soon, and would that include admitting any nation which applies?

THE PRESIDENT. [The only thing I know about it at this moment is that for some months it has been a matter of casual discussion between the Secretary of State and me. I know they are studying it and have a group set up to study, but I am sure there is no readiness to report whatsoever--no conclusion reached.]

Q. L. G. Laycook, Nashville Tennessean: Mr. President, would you comment on the resolution adopted by the Joint Atomic Energy Committee last week urging cancellation of the DixonYates contract?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I won't comment on it except it seemed to be drawn upon strictly party lines; that is the only thing I noted about it particularly.

Q. Lloyd M. Schwartz, Fairchild Publications: Mr. President, I wonder if you could give us your views on standby authority to freeze prices and wages. There have been reports of a decision that you would ask Congress for such authority.

THE PRESIDENT. I could give you a long speech now. One of the first subjects given to me in the War Department somewhere back along 1928 or '29 to study was this one. I think I have conferred with literally hundreds of people in the United States, pro and con, on this subject. I really can't say that I think solution is vital, and I don't know whether there is any use of starting to talk on the subject unless you are going to talk for a half hour; I don't think you want me to do that.I would say this: if Congress sees fit to do it, I not only can live with it, but I think in certain respects it would be advantageous. On the other hand, the mere existence of that kind of authority has a certain psychological reaction on certain sections of our population who believe that it implies an intent to extend that kind of control to our economy in time of peace, and it also implies an intent to go your own way in time of war without consultation with the Congress. Now, there are psychological values here against immediate--let's say--economic values in a crisis. I think that Congress can act probably fast enough so that no great damage will be done if the two branches of Government work together well. It is not one of the factors in the legislation that we need to which I attach terrific importance.

Q. William V. Shannon, New York Post: Mr. President, in line with this earlier question about filming the news conferences, the principal point of the criticism is not how much is cut out, but

that the television networks, unlike newspaper editors, don't have the power to decide what to use, and that is decided at the White House first, and they get the censored transcript. And some people feel it is more than a technical question, more a question of freedom of the press.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, let me say this: that no head of any broadcasting company has yet protested to me, and I can't very well make any answer until I get their protests and their reasons for it.

Q. Chalmers M. Roberts, Washington Post and Times Herald: Mr. President, in answering Mr. Wilson's question a while back, you said the purpose of your program in Formosa, in regard to the Formosa. situation, was honestly and hopefully to prevent war. Could you tell us whether, as of now, you feel as hopeful or more hopeful or otherwise than when you launched this program?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think at least we have made this stride, that we certainly have removed any doubt from anybody's mind, friend or potential foe, as to the determination of America to see that this great island barrier is maintained intact in the Pacific, that we are not going to let international communism get that spearhead extending into the Pacific and, therefore, extend its influence in that region. Now, that has been made crystal clear in the resolution and to that extent ought to be helpful; because so many things happen in the international world through probing, through false conclusions that might be drawn from a successful probe, the thought that the victim will never react. Here it is an attempt that has been made, at least in the field of intention, to make our purposes clear.

Q. Richard L. Wilson, Cowles Publications: Permit me to follow that up a bit. I think in one of your messages to Congress--I think it was the state of the Union message--you referred to a world stalemate, the possibility of it continuing. Do you think the element of stalemate is implied in the Far Eastern situation as it stands today?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, of that I can't be too sure. I used the word "stalemate" deliberately, Mr. Wilson, because it seems to me, we get so much in the habit of using terms or phrases, and then each of us attaches to the term or phrase his own meaning; for instance, this thing of coexistence: someone defines it with an adjective, and suddenly it is appeasement. To my mind, coexistence is, in fact, a state of our being as long as we are not attempting to destroy the other side. I make it a very simple thing in my mind, but I find that others give additional interpretations that I don't mean at all. Now, when I said "stalemate," I was trying to describe where neither side is getting what it desires in this whole world struggle, but they at least have sense enough to agree that they must not pursue it deliberately and through force of arms; that is all.

Q. Mr. Wilson: Do you think, sir, that that would be a good result from this present situation?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, you mean, in that one point?

Q. Mr. Wilson: Yes, yes, sir.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, again I say I don't believe I will comment on the one point at all.

Q. Paul Scott Rankine, Reuters: Mr. President, you referred to this great iron barrier being kept intact in the Far East. Could you be more specific about what the great iron barrier is?

THE PRESIDENT. [I didn't say "iron barrier," I said "island barrier." Well, of course, it's largely islands. There are, of course, a few bits of the mainland involved along the eastern coast, but you know where they are. [What I mean is that we are making that the principal feature of our whole protective system in the region; that is all I mean.]

Q. Edward T. Folliard, Washington Post and Times Herald: Mr. President, you have used the term "miscalculation." You do not want Red China to miscalculate in this situation. Do you feel that wars have started as a result of a miscalculation or, to put it another way, do you feel that recent wars might have been avoided had something been said in advance to head off a miscalculation?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, of course, we don't want to get into a discussion of military history here, I think. But I do believe this: I believe World War I did start largely through miscalculation. A prince was murdered; there began to be an exchange of notes back and forth; and I believe that there was a miscalculation of what Russia, France, and Britain would do, and that created that war. The Second World War, I would rather doubt that. I think that you had a personality there that was so bent upon achieving certainly pan-European power, at least, that probably nothing would stop it. I feel that the Korean conflict started because of our failing to make clear that we would defend this small nation, which had just started, in a pinch. Now, I don't mean to say--I am not trying to attach any blame to anybody here; but we were weak in forces, we were hopeful for peace--and I think it's logical to hope for peace--we took our forces out of there; and it became possibly the conviction of the Reds that they could take the country over without resistance.

Q. Douglass Cater, The Reporter Magazine: Mr. President, some of the Senators have criticized the recent resolution in that it leaves the islands that are in greatest peril in the greatest obscurity, namely, Matsu and Quemoy. Do you feel there is a danger of miscalculation because there is not exact knowledge as to what our position towards them is to be?

THE PRESIDENT. [Well, I repeat, to be as exact as you can; but when it comes down to the tactical details of these things, you just simply cannot afford to be too specific. So again I say on that particular point, I shall comment no more.]

Q. Robert E. Clark, International News Service: Mr. President, one of General Ridgway's reasons for opposing a reduction in the strength of the Army is reportedly his belief that it would require ground troops, the use of our ground troops, to help defend Quemoy and the Matsus. Is it your opinion that we could defend Formosa only with air and naval units without committing any ground forces?

THE PRESIDENT. Ground forces other than on Formosa, is that what you are talking about? We have small detachments on Formosa, training troops; we have had small detachments in some of the other places, training troops, and that sort of thing. But when it comes to committing land forces of the United States in this particular situation, there has been no recommendation of that kind made to me at all.

Merriman Smith, United Press: Thank you, Mr. President.

(32) Message to Nationwide Meetings in Support of the Campaign for Radio Free Europe February 8, 1955

[Delivered over closed circuit television'from the White House This message was broadcast to 35 meetings held under the auspices of the American Heritage Foundation.]

EL-Dl6-52 (RA)

[Delivered over closed circuit television from the White House]

I AM happy to be with you tonight for I strongly believe that Radio Free Europe and the Crusade for Freedom are vital to success in the battle for men's minds. Many of us learned during the war that the most potent force is spiritual; that the appeal to men's minds produces a dedication which surmounts every trial and test until victory is won. To toughen, strengthen, fortify such dedication to the cause of freedom is the mission of Radio Free Europe. Substantial progress has already been made. The free world is growing stronger because its peoples are growing in their determination to stand together and in their faith that freedom and justice will triumph. Radio Free Europe, each day of the year, nourishes this growth.

Here at home, we Americans face the future with confidence. But we must also face up to the dangers that still lurk about us. We must ever work to strengthen our posture of defense and to reinforce our alliances and friendships in the free world. While we maintain our vigilance at home and abroad, we must help intensify the will for freedom in the satellite countries behind the Iron Curtain. These countries are in the Soviet backyard; and only so long as their people are reminded that the outside world has not forgotten them--only that long do they remain as potential deterrents to Soviet aggression. The great majority of the 70 million captives in these satellite countries have known liberty in the past. They now need our constant friendship and help if they are to believe in their future.

Therefore, the mission of Radio Free Europe merits greater support than before. It serves our national security and the cause of peace. I have long given the Crusade for Freedom my strong endorsement. I did that because I am familiar with its purposes, its operations, the people who run it, and, perhaps, most important--its hard-hitting effectiveness as an independent American enterprise. I know that our country and our friends behind the Iron Curtain can count on you for active participation and leadership in this most critical of all battles--the winning of men's minds. Without this victory, we can have no other victories. By your efforts, backed up by America, we can achieve our great goal--that of enabling us and all the peoples of the world to enjoy in peace the blessings of freedom.

NOTE: This message was broadcast to 35 meetings held under the auspices of the American Heritage Foundation.

(33) President's Press Conference February 9, 1955 [President Eisenhower's sixtieth news conference was held in the Executive office Building from 10:31 to ll:0lam, in attendance: 230.]

EL-Dl6-60 (PC)

[This is a complete transcript of the news conference of this date. Those portions of the

President's replies which were not released for broadcasting or direct quotation at that time are enclosed in brackets.]

THE PRESIDENT. Good morning. Please be seated.

One announcement of little importance to anyone except myself: I hope to get a few hours away from this city starting tomorrow afternoon. I am going down with the Secretary of the Treasury to his farm in Georgia.

I have two announcements of some import, or comments, let us say, first with respect to the foreign situation; the second announcement respecting the domestic.

In the foreign situation we have seen this change taking place in the rulership in the Soviets. We know, of course, when any major change of that kind takes place, that it does express dissatisfaction with what has been going on internally.

Now, what this means to the world is not yet apparent. It won't be apparent for some time. It does not change our basic policies nor the basic methods we employ in pursuit of those policies: a just and lasting peace, to remain strong ourselves while we are doing it, and to help our friends grow strong and confident so that this burden of fear and eventually other and more material-type burdens will be lifted from the backs of men. We are going steadily ahead, and while we watch every change in the situation, there is no reason for changing our basic attitude.

I want to talk now about something for a moment that affects everybody in America. That is education. Yesterday morning I sent to the Congress a plan which I think is necessary in order that the youth of our Nation will not be robbed of their chance to get the kind of education to which they are entitled; indeed; the kind of education that they need if they are properly to discharge their duties as citizens of the United States.

Education is really bread-and-butter citizenship. It is just necessary to the developing of citizens that can perform their duties properly. Education very properly in our country has been the duty and responsibility of the locality and the State. That is a very wise provision of our Constitution, reserving as it did all the powers not specifically given to the Federal Government, reserving them to the States. They exercise authority in this field, and they should. However, there are a number of reasons why we are so short of classrooms today. We had a war mobilization that, in more or less degree, affected our country for a long time. We have outmoded laws in many States affecting districts or debts or tax limits, and so on. There have been many obstructions to going ahead in this work.

Now, in spite of that, last year was a banner year in the building of schools. There was more than $2 billion spent. We have to add 50,000 [schoolrooms] a year to keep up with the population. Last year we constructed 60,000, and at that rate we are never going to reach the objective of getting rid of the shortage of 340,000 as of today. The shortage has not just sprung up overnight. You find a steady growth in it reaching clear back to 1940. It was already, in 1940, something over 160,000, and the estimates show a gradual increase until today, 340,000.

Now, in order to observe the right and responsibility of States and communities in this field and yet for the Federal Government to apply leadership and to give the kind of help it should, compels us to follow a path that is sometimes not as readily discernible as we should like. The

system we have followed is to use the Federal Government to purchase bonds of districts where they are not readily marketable at a reasonable price; to assist the States in forming agencies outside of the State government itself, so that the difficulty of debt and other types of laws can be overcome; and finally in those districts where a clear case of need can be shown, where there is no other way of doing it, a certain amount of grant-in-aid matching with the States.

You will recall that a long time ago--18 months ago, I think, or at least a year--there was appointed with the authority of Congress this White House Conference on Education, which would follow upon the conferences in several States. The idea was that they would meet in the effort to solve this problem, devise a long-range plan. For this reason and in order not to get in the way of the recommendations that will be filed by those conferences, this is an emergency plan so far as construction is concerned, although it does point out certain ways that could be permanently applied to this problem.

The objective is, though, as far as the Federal Government is concerned, to keep the responsibility where it belongs, to apply leadership on a strong basis, to get an emergency program of construction started instantly, and to bring, with Federal help, this problem under control just as rapidly as possible.

Those were the two things I wanted to talk about. We will go to questions.

Q. Marvin Arrowsmith, Associated Press: Mr. President, in the light of Foreign Minister Molotov's tough-talk speech against the United States yesterday, do you think this shakeup in the Soviet Government means a calculated tougher policy towards the United States?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think I would not at the moment, Mr. Arrowsmith, speculate on exactly what it is going to mean. It doesn't necessarily mean that, because they would say anything that would suit their purposes at the moment of a great significant change of this kind in their government. I would say that we must be watchful and alert and pursue our policies as we have been pursuing them.

Q. Merriman Smith, United Press: Mr. President, I don't know whether you are aware of it, because it was announced in Moscow just before the conference started, but one of your old friends and associates was just made Defense Minister by the Russians, General Zhukov. Would you think that, following up Mr. Arrowsmith's question, that General Zhukov's appointment as Minister of Defense would indicate a stronger defense policy on their part, possibly toward this country?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, again, Mr. Smith, I can scarcely interpret that act of theirs in terms of a specific intent on their part. Now, when I knew Marshal Zhukov, I will say this: He was a competent soldier. A man could not have conducted the campaigns he did, could not have explained them so lucidly and in terms of his own strength and his own weaknesses and so on, except that he was a well-trained, splendid military leader. He and I developed personally a practice of getting along and seeing eye to eye on a number of our local problems in Berlin. So far as I was concerned--and I believe he was honest about it--we were trying to set up a pattern, if we could, in Berlin, in our little local place there, to show that even two nations could get along if they would both recognize the folly of not getting along. What this means today, I don't know. The last time I had a direct letter from him was April 1946, and that was a long time ago.

Q. Robert E. Clark, International News Service: Mr. President, Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov claimed yesterday that Russia's atomic strength is now superior to our own. Do we have any cause to believe this might be true?

THE PRESIDENT. Certainly there is no proof to that effect. I should say that would be rather a remarkable feat, but I believe it is not worthwhile speculating on.

Q. Chalmers M. Roberts, Washington Post and Times Herald: Mr. President, in the Molotov speech yesterday, he said that he did not think in the case of another war that world civilization would be destroyed. This was in some contrast to Malenkov's statement last March in which he said, in a nuclear war both sides would be destroyed. Could you tell us, aside from the political implications, on a scientific basis, from what you know, something of this as to whether in fact there is a threat in the H-bomb and other nuclear weapons to the whole world?

THE PRESIDENT. Of course, there are, as we know, some threats in the use of nuclear weapons over and beyond the immediately destructive area, where it destroys by shock and the thermal effects, and so on. There are certain radioactive effects that in the immediate vicinity can be very, very bad, indeed, as we well know. There are methods of protection.

Now, when you begin to talk in terms of "Would this destroy civilization or would it not?" I should say we are talking in comparative terms. What is the destruction of civilization, and, in addition, how many of these things do you use? How near do you approach saturation in any place ?

I would say this: the thing is so serious that intelligent people ought to forego a great many lesser ambitions in the effort to achieve an understanding, under a method where the whole world could be assured that that understanding was going to be obeyed by all parties concerned--which means there must be some kind of inspection service where all the world could trust it--that we are not pushing toward that kind of a war. So, whether or not civilization is destroyed, I say it is so serious that we just cannot pretend to be intelligent human beings unless we pursue with all our might, with all our thought, all our soul, you might say, some way of solving this problem. It's that bad at least.

Q. Robert L. Riggs, Louisville Courier-Journal: Returning to your education message, sir, Senator Hill, who is Chairman of the Senate committee on education, and Senator Clements, who is the acting majority leader, criticized your program rather strongly yesterday as being inadequate, and they said it merely loaded more debts on the States and communities which could not afford to pay the debt. Could you comment on that, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. Did they mention the debt of the United States?

Q. Mr. Riggs: Well, they are--no, sir; they did not.

THE PRESIDENT. There is perhaps some difference in conviction here represented. I believe that the greatest amount of authority, which means comparable responsibility, must be retained in the localities in our country or we are working steadily away from the system of government that has made this country great. That kind of a system exploits private initiative, local initiative, local care for the expenditures. As quickly as you start spending Federal money in great amounts, it looks like free money. The shibboleth of free money from Washington can certainly

damage. So maybe my system is not as extreme as either side would like. I take something that I believe to be effective and good for the United States, and I stand by it.

Q. Garnett D. Horner, Washington Star: Mr. President, to return to the Marshal Zhukov business a moment ago, he was quoted in an interview yesterday as saying that in 1945 you had told him that the United States would never attack the Soviet Union, and he had told you that the Soviet Union would never attack the United States. Also, he said that you had twice invited him to visit here, and he still dreams of doing so. I wonder if you could tell us your version of that 1945 conversation and your feelings about the prospects of such a visit?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, that is remarkably accurate. Now, when I asked him to visit our country, I was acting as the agent of my government, which directed me to do so; and more than that, arrangements had been made once. My plane had been put at his disposal, and my son was detailed as his aide. I remember he made the remark, "Well, I shall certainly be very safe," with my plane and my son. [Laughter]

We were good friends, and we could talk in that fashion.

I explained to him how absolutely impossible it was for a democracy to organize a surprise aggression against anybody. Our processes are open. Every time you get money or you change anything in your military affairs, you go to Congress. It is debated. There is no possibility of a country such as ours producing a completely surprise attack on any other. That is what I was emphasizing to him. Of course, from their standpoint, he felt that Russia was a very peace-loving nation.

Q. Paul Wooton, New Orleans Times Picayune: Mr. President, you have on your desk a report on transportation. Will that be made public soon?

THE PRESIDENT. [Well, it isn't on my desk yet. I don't know whether it is a report; it is a study as I have seen it. It has been going back and forth, and we have been going at it a long time. It isn't ready at this moment, at least, for publication. And its eventual destiny, I have forgotten the details.]

Q. Kenneth M. Scheibel, Gannett News Service: Sir, part of the trouble we are told from Russia is that they are having difficulties with their agriculture and their food supplies. Do you see in that situation any chance for us to do any trading with them, or is that a business of building up our enemy?

THE PRESIDENT. [I think that a question like that comes within the context of so many intertwined questions that you would have to get a whole program laid out in front of you. Now, what does this mean? Everything comes back here, when you really get down to the bottom of things and study them--everything comes back to how much confidence can we develop in the words of people who have not hesitated to break their word in the past? Where do we have deeds and actions to prove what they are trying to do? And I think that every single agreement, engagement, commitment of any kind has always got to have that as its background; because otherwise you are very likely to weaken your position, either psychologically, politically, materially, economically, in some form. So I wouldn't want to comment just on this one facet of such a possibility.].

Q. Joseph C. Harsch, Christian Science Monitor: Mr. President, to refer back to Mr. Horner's question, is that invitation to General Zhukov still open?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, as a matter of fact, this is the first time it has been mentioned to me since I have been in my present responsible post. You can well imagine that I wouldn't stand here and suddenly issue an invitation without consultation with my advisers. So I would say this would be a remarkable thing at the present state of affairs, but I certainly wouldn't hesitate to talk it over with my people if we found it desirable.

Q. Charles S. von Fremd, CBS News: There have been growing reports and speculation, sir, that possibly the Soviet Union does not now hold the political strength that it once did control over Red China. If this is true, it would certainly endanger the present situation in the Formosa Straits. But I wonder, sir, if in telling us whether or not, if you can, you have received such word from your advisers, if you could also let us know whether or not you feel there is a possibility of other satellites breaking away from the Kremlin.

THE PRESIDENT. [I should say this: there is no direct evidence that there has been any weakening of relationships between Moscow and the capitals with which it has been dealing. There is, of course, always hopeful speculation in this line, but no evidence.]

Q. Sarah McClendon, El Paso Times: Sir, the Federal Power Commission and the natural gas industry seem to be waiting to hear this Cabinet committee study on energy supplies and fuel resources. That has been held up for some time. Can you say when that will be ready?

THE PRESIDENT. [Not held up; it is just not ready. I don't know of anything quite so complicated as a study on the energy supplies of the United States in all of its components, because you have imports, you have competition among the various types of energy within our own country, you've got everything from hydroelectric power to power produced by residual oil imported into this country. It is a complicated study that is being worked on all the time.[1] That is all I can say about it at the moment.]

[1]On February 26 "The White House Report on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy," prepared by the Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy, was released by the White House in mimeograph form. The recommendations of the Committee related to (1) natural gas regulation; (2) sales below cost by interstate pipeline companies; (3) eminent domain for natural gas storage; (4) crude oil imports and residual fuel oil imports; (5) petroleum refining capacity; (6) tax incentives; (7) research and development program for coal; (8) unemployment and business distress in the coal industry; (9) coal freight rates; (10) coal exports; (11) mobilization requirements for coke; (12) Government fuel purchasing policy.

Q. Laurence H. Burd, Chicago Tribune: Mr. President, you mentioned hearing from Marshal Zhukov last in April 1946.

THE PRESIDENT. Directly, I said.

Q. Mr. Burd: Could you say what that involved?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, it was--I think I can recall it--it was a letter. You see, I left Berlin in November 45, and he corresponded and he sent me a present. I think it was an enormous bear rug. I still have it, and something else of that kind. That was all.

Q. Clark R. Mollenhoff, Des Moines Register and Tribune: Mr. President, on February 1st the White House overruled the CAB on a decision involving a certificate of Northwest Airlines and

Pan American Airlines on flights to Hawaii. That White House action overruled a 5-to-0 decision in the CAB, and last Monday you revised that order after Senator Thye and Representative Judd called on you. I wonder if you could tell us why you revised your decision, and also if you could discuss the general procedure when these independent agency cases, in the CAB, are called to the attention of the White House.

THE PRESIDENT. It is very simple in this case. Information came to my attention that convinced me I had made an error. And so I tried to correct it. The actual facts were these: I am directed by the Congress to cut down subsidies in this air business, which means that when you have unprofitable competition on lines, you had better look at it very, very closely, because this occasions a greater deficit. I am also directed to preserve competition so far as this can be done, but always with this other conflicting consideration of cutting down the subsidies. In this case, it looked like we should get rid of one line on the Hawaiian run; and the line that had the most of the traffic and which had the smallest subsidy last year on that line, at least as far as figures showed, that was the one I was going to go with. I made that decision. What happened then was that the Chairman of the Board came over to see me and pointed out that all of their calculations showed that within 2 years, they believed, the entire subsidy would be eliminated from the Pacific runs. He showed, therefore, that even if you did happen to have a subsidy, since now you have your computations for subsidies made on the operations of the full line, that here we had a case where we could well afford to go ahead with the competitive system for a while and still believe that we would come out of the subsidy area. So I said, in that case we will renew this for a short period, which I did for 3 years.

Q. Gould Lincoln, Washington Star: Mr. President, there have been in the newspapers many reports that the Secretary of the Army, Mr. Stevens, is to be replaced. Could you tell us if there is any truth in that?

THE PRESIDENT. There is not a word of it that has come to my ears, Mr. Lincoln, not a word.

Q. Alan S. Emory, Watertown Times: Mr. President, in view of the fact that the education aid message went to the Hill before the highway message, and in view of the substance of your education message, do you think those two factors will silence the critics who have been saying the administration is paying more attention to highways than to schools?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, it is not going to silence critics; of that I am sure. [Laughter]

Q. George H. Hall, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: Can you tell us whether the Malenkov resignation was a surprise to this Government or whether we had diplomatic or intelligence reports indicating that it was coming up?

THE PRESIDENT. [Well, I think that our observers and people in Moscow for a long time reported that things weren't exactly as they appeared on the surface, but I never had seen any kind of prediction as to the exact things that happened yesterday, no.]

Q. Lloyd M. Schwartz, Fairchild Publications: Mr. President, the Labor and Commerce Departments reported yesterday that unemployment rose 500,000 in the month to mid-January to a total of 3.3 million, and the factory work force in January was 500,000 lower than a year earlier. Do you find this any cause for concern?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, here is a type of statistic that is examined every week or practically every day by the economic advisers of the Labor and Commerce Departments, in consultation, of course, with myself. Now, there is always a seasonal drop in employment right after Christmas; this year, looking at the comparable curves, it seems that this drop was not as acute as it has been in the recent past. I don't mean to say that you can be complacent about such things. On the contrary, you watch them with the closest possible concern. However, it is within the bounds, you might say, of historical precedent.

Q. Roscoe Drummond, New York Herald Tribune: Mr. President, how do you appraise the state of affairs in the Formosa Straits with reference to the evacuation of the Tachens and the possibility of a cease-fire?

THE PRESIDENT. I think it would be idle to speculate, Mr. Drummond, on the possibility of a cease-fire. We asked Red China, or the United Nations did, to come in and talk it over. They declined and issued a very bellicose statement. Therefore, on that I couldn't say what may happen. Now, with regard to the evacuation, it is proceeding exactly according to plan. If nothing happens, it should be completed very soon. There has been no untoward incident. In one case I believe one of our planes got a little lost, wandered in a bad area and got hit, but the crew was saved. There has been no real interference. It looks like it would go ahead for the moment.

Q. Nat S. Finney, Buffalo Evening News: Mr. President, can you tell us whether your freedom of action to order the use of nuclear weapons in connection with the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores is in any way limited by understandings with our allies?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, if the United States, of course, got into trouble alone and were attacked, I don't know of any understanding with any allies that applies. I think understandings with allies applies when you are in any kind of an action in concert with them. I have not thought of that point in exactly the way you have stated, but I think it would be a United States decision.

Q. Edward T. Folliard, Washington Post and Times Herald: Mr. President, a bill has been introduced which would make former Presidents of the United States members of the Senate. They would receive pay and quarters, but wouldn't be permitted to vote. They would be Senators at Large. It would now affect Mr. Hoover and Mr. Truman, and perhaps ultimately yourself. Do you think the bill has merit?

THE PRESIDENT. [Frankly, I say this, Mr. Folliard: I am not too sure. Any man who has served in high posts in his government--and this doesn't mean merely the Presidency--has acquired a certain amount of experience where, if his faculties have held together reasonably well, he should be of some value to his country. [In my own case, I thought I had left the service of my country forever in 1948, I believe in February. I soon found I was back in, in one form or another.[I believe those people are always available. I believe each one of them is proud and feels a sense of satisfaction when his experience and wisdom are called upon. And if it could be better utilized by giving this rather formal post, I certainly would have no objection. I would never argue against such a thing. I am not sure that it would be an exact answer, but it would be all right.]

Q. Robert J. Donovan, New York Herald Tribune: Mr. President, in consideration of the trade program in the House, there has been a move to add import quotas for oil to protect the coal

industry. If this has come to your attention, have you any comment on it?

THE PRESIDENT. [It hasn't come to my attention that specific way. But we are trying to liberalize trade on a reciprocal basis, particularly in selected commodities. There has been great progress made in the last 2 years in eliminating quotas from the normal practices of governments with respect to this trade business. I would very much deplore seeing us going backward and establishing quotas that were at least fixed by law.]

Merriman Smith, United Press: Thank you, Mr. President.

(34) Message to Meetings of the Nationwide Clinical Conference on Heart Ailments February 9, 1955

[Delivered over closed circuit television from the White House. This message was broadcast to 32 meetings held under the sponsorship of the American Medical Association.]

EL-Dl6-30 (IR)

[Delivered over closed circuit television from the White House]

IT IS a privilege to greet you tonight, and to express my gratification at the purpose of your separate but united meetings from coast-to-coast. Your program tonight, as it has been described to me, is another example in our society of the collaboration between free enterprise and pure learning--an instance in which business and the medical profession work together for the common good.

If the annual toll from coronary heart disease were revealed to the American people as a casualty list from the battlefield, the effect would be one of national shock, and a demand that something be done. That something is being done, in such programs as the one tonight, is significant, and encouraging.

You, the physicians of America, are linked in this enterprise by a bond far stronger than the cables of a television network. Your bond of union is a common and selfless aim. Your principal motives are first, a concern for the welfare of your patients, and second, that restless curiosity, that hunger for knowledge of better ways, which is the hallmark of the man of science.

Our way of life provides the climate in which the chronic questioner is free to rove, to doubt, to explore, in the endless search for new and fuller answers. Every assistant in a laboratory, every researcher, every medical student, every specialist, every family doctor, is a participant in this search--a search which has added twenty-five years to the American life span within the memory of many of you in this audience.

These new years of expectancy have been a bonus beyond price added to the wealth of our Republic. For them we, your fellow Americans, owe you our grateful thanks.

A nation's strength is directly affected by its people's health. In that light, we must strengthen and support those agencies of Government which are concerned with the problems of national health.

Yet, the role of Government in these matters must always be secondary, and supplementary. The first responsibility lies with the community, determined to foster good health and to provide well

for the ailing and the injured; with the scientist, as he works in freedom towards goals of his own choosing; and with the physician, who brings his healing ministry not to the State, or to the mass of people as such, but always to some man, or woman, or child--some individual human being worthy of his dedicated care.

Godspeed you on your mission.

NOTE: This message was broadcast to 32 meetings held under the sponsorship of the American Medical Association.

(97) Message Recorded for Use in Observance of Armed Forces Day February 15, 1955 aired May 12, 1955

EL-Dl6-30 (IR)

My friends here at home and overseas: We Americans have constantly pledged that we will never permit aggression. But we must always be prepared to defeat it. On May 21st the Armed Forces of the United States will hold "open house" to give our own and other peace-loving people the best possible opportunity to see how ready we are, in military terms, for any threat to our security or to the peace of the free world. As Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States I earnestly hope that all who can will accept this invitation to become better acquainted with the armed components of our National power for peace.

(45) Remarks Recorded for the Opening of the Red Cross Campaign February 15, 1955 aired February 28, 1955

[The President's remarks were recorded at the White House on February 15.]

EL-Dl6-30 (IR)

My Fellow Americans

Today I should like to talk to you about the campaign for the Red Cross, which we now open.

While I do this, I have asked some of my young girl and boy friends to come in here with me. And this is an important phase of my little talk, because these youngsters are our future leaders. They are our hope for a brighter tomorrow.

Now, many of these lessons of leadership they learn at home, in their churches, in their schools, and in the other organizations to which they belong--like this young Boy Scout. But they learn a lot from the Red Cross in which they are all junior members. They learn that the Red Cross is in fact our big brother. It typifies the spirit of the good neighbor. Now these sentiments-these qualities--are important to a democracy. They mean that we are ready to help one another. These youngsters will learn this as they see the Red Cross rush into disaster areas, to help out the unfortunate, to take care of every kind of disaster that befalls man in peace and in war.

Now for myself I am of course far better acquainted with the Red Cross in war than I am in peace, because I spent so many years of my life in the Army. There they brought to the fighting man in all the Services a touch of home. They made him feel that his sacrifices were worthwhile and appreciated by all of us at home.

The Red Cross is now asking for 30 million members and 85 million dollars.

Personally I think those sights are far too low. Mrs. Eisenhower and I have just renewed our membership in the Red Cross. It is my ambition that by the end of March I can call every single American my fellow member of the American Red Cross. Thank you, youngsters, for being with me.

(38) Recorded for the "Back to God" Program of the American Legion February 15, 1955 aired February 20, 1955

[The President's remarks were part of an American Legion program, which was broadcast over radio and television from 8 to 8:30pm.]

EL-Dl6-30 (IR)

THE FOUNDING FATHERS expressed in words for all to read the ideal of Government based upon the dignity of the individual. That ideal previously had existed only in the hearts and minds of men. They produced the timeless documents upon which the Nation is rounded and has grown great. They, recognizing God as the author of individual fights, declared that the purpose of Government is to secure those rights.

To you and to me this ideal of Government is a self-evident truth. But in many lands the State claims to be the author of human rights. The tragedy of that claim runs through all history and, indeed, dominates our own times. If the State gives rights, it can--and inevitably will--take away those rights.

Without God, there could be no American form of Government, nor an American way of life. Recognition of the Supreme Being is the first--the most basic--expression of Americanism. Thus the Founding Fathers saw it, and thus, with God's help, it will continue to be.

It is significant, I believe, that the American Legion--an organization of war veterans--has seen fit to conduct a "Back to God" movement as part of its Americanism program. Veterans realize, perhaps more clearly than others, the prior place that Almighty God holds in our national life. And they can appreciate, through personal experience, that the really decisive battleground of American freedom is in the hearts and minds of our own people.

Now, if I may make a personal observation--you, my fellow citizens, have bestowed upon my associates and myself, ordinary men, the honor and the duty of serving you in the administration of your Government. More and more we are conscious of the magnitude of that task.

The path we travel is narrow and long, beset with many dangers. Each day we must ask that Almighty God will set and keep His protecting hand over us so that we may pass on to those who come after us the heritage of a free people, secure in their God-given rights and in full control of a Government dedicated to the preservation of those rights. I can ask nothing more of each of you of all Americans--than that you join with the American Legion in its present campaign.

(41) President's Press Conference February 23, 1955 [President Eisenhower's sixty-first news conference was held in the Executive Office Building from 10:33 to 11:04am, in attendance: 227.]

EL-Dl6-6l (PC)

[This is a complete transcript of the news conference of this date. All of the President's replies were released for broadcasting or direct quotation at that time.

THE PRESIDENT. Good morning. Please be seated.

I have no general announcements this morning, ladies and gentlemen. So we will go right to questions.

Q. Robert E. Clark, International News Service: Mr. President, can you tell us how you feel about the Democratic proposal to cut everybody's taxes by

THE PRESIDENT. The question affects this proposal for cutting the income taxes of every individual in the United States You have asked a question, Mr. Clark, that takes some time to answer, because you asked for my opinion about it. Now, in the first place, any proposal to reduce taxes is, of course, popular; and at first glance this is a kind of proposal that should make an appeal to low income brackets. Let's take a little closer look at this proposal and start off with this one observation. Whenever you have inflation, the immediate effect, of course, is to hurt first the people of fixed incomes--white-collar workers and others who for the moment at least are on relatively fixed incomes. But in the long run, the person that is hurt most is the person who lays aside savings in the forms of pension, insurance plans, and savings bonds for use in his older age. For example, anybody who paid up all of his share of a pension by as early as 1939 was getting in 1953 half of the worth of the pension plan he had bought.

When we talk about decreasing revenues at a time when the Government, in spite of every saving we have been able to make, is still spending somewhat more than it takes in, we are reaching some kind of heights in fiscal irresponsibility. Because this does have on the surface a popular or appealing appearance, these people apparently hope it may be passed. They have not had the courage to put it in as a bill on its own merits. They have attached it as an amendment to a bill which is for the continuation of the 52 percent as opposed to the 47 percent taxes on corporations and for the continuation of excise taxes on liquor, tobacco, gasoline, automobiles, transportation, and the like.

From those two continuations of tax programs, we expect and anticipate getting 2,800 million, roughly that kind of money. This $20 exemption would in the first full year of its operation reduce our income by 2,300 million. We inherited in 1953 a budget that contemplated a 9.9 billion deficit in Federal financing. By hard work--and I assure you it is hard work when you realize that every bureau of Government feels it should have more money--we have reduced that to an expected deficit in 1956 of less than two and a half billion, or in that neighborhood, estimated.

Now we are going back to deficit spending, the most insidious thing that can happen to a free economy, and particularly in its bad effect upon low income groups. I should like to call your attention to a statement by economists of the American Federation of Labor, which said the year 1954 was their finest overall salary year of their history. In spite of the fact that their salary increases were only 5 to 9 cents, or something of that order, in general insignificant or small as compared to salary increases of the past, their purchasing power, due to the stability of the dollar, their overall position in the salary angle was the best of their history.

In the last 2 years, the cost of living has varied less than onehalf of 1 percent. From 1939 to 1953 the dollar went from 100 cents to 52 cents. It is that kind of thing that must be stopped if we are to preserve the principles on which this country was established. It is based on a free economy which in turn is based on a stable dollar, which in turn is more important to all low income and fixed income groups than it is to rich people.

Rich people can buy equities, can afford to invest in equities, and as the dollar cheapens, the amount of dollars that they have invested goes up and up. But the fixed income group, the man who is buying an insurance policy, I repeat, or looking forward to living on his pension, is the one that is hurt. We simply cannot have this kind of thing in responsible government.

Now, I might remark that obviously these people have put this $2,300 million reduction in a tax bill that will keep this 5,800 million for us in the belief that there cannot, then, anything be done about it. I say if this thing is to be tested in the Congress--and I admit, of course, they have the perfect right to do it--let them do it on its own merits and not attach it to these other bills.

Q. Merriman Smith, United Press: Mr. President, in the light of what you have just said, how, then, do you feel about your goal as you announced in your state of the Union message of achieving a tax reduction in 1956?

THE PRESIDENT. As you know, through the efforts of reducing governmental expenditures, I talked to you awhile ago, we returned last year to the people the greatest tax reduction in history, 7,600 million. With the increased confidence brought about to business, to investors, to purchasers, to everybody else, we have a very healthy upturn in our economy. We hope that will continue. We hope to continue to reduce expenditures. We hope that gross national product will continue to go up, and with no higher taxes we will probably, and believe we can, get to the point that we can return some more in 1956. But it must be done on a thoroughly worked out, analytical basis, so as to achieve the kind of stability in living costs and the proper distribution of taxes that was achieved in the plan of last year which was worked out by so many different groups.

Q. Mrs. May Craig, Maine Papers: Mr. President, would you veto a tax bill with such a rider on it, and require a two-thirds vote?

THE PRESIDENT. Mrs. Craig, I have told this group many times, I have never yet been able to predict for myself exactly what I am going to do in such cases until it comes up to me. If the bill comes up to me in exact form, I might predict, now, what I could do. But the fact is, it could come up in so many different forms, with so many different angles, that I think it is best to wait to see what happens before I make my own predictions to myself.

Q. Marvin Arrowsmith, Associated Press: Mr. President, is this Government studying whether to offer surplus wheat to Russia?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, as you know, this suggestion has been brought up, and I have directed certain people who have to deal with this in our Government to look it over. For myself, I look at it askance. I would not go overboard on such an idea until everybody who is trained in the whole business of psychological conflict and all the rest of these things look at it very coldly and carefully, because I am afraid that what the United States might mean as a fine gesture of good will could be twisted and turned to our disadvantage. But in any event, it will be studied

carefully. There will be a recommendation made to me on it.

Q. Laurence H. Burd, Chicago Tribune: Mr. President, can you say what recent steps have been taken with regard to the flyers being held by Red China and whether you think the chances are better or worse for their release than a few weeks ago?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, there has been no recent development of note or of great significance. I could not give you an evaluation of chances, whether or not they are now better than they were. I just believe this: in all of these directions in which we believe the Chinese Communists have been acting wrongfully toward us, including these flyers of which you speak, we have got to insist upon a just and decent settlement and never cease doing so, never to accept anything as a completion of the problem until justice has been done.

Q. Mr. Burd: Are we leaving it with the United Nations for quite a lot longer time?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, you say, "leaving it with the United Nations." We use every avenue open to us--through third parties, through the United Nations, everywhere that we can exercise any of our influence, we try to do it, as I say, to get a just solution to these problems.

Q. Chalmers M. Roberts, Washington Post and Times Herald: Mr. President, after the Atomic Energy Commission's report last week on the hydrogen bomb fallout, you commented through Mr. Hagerty that it demonstrated your belief that there should be some agreement on arms, international agreement on armaments. With the U.N. arms meeting about to open in London this week, could you tell us, sir, whether you have anticipated any possibility of agreement, or does the matter appear to still be in deadlock?

THE PRESIDENT. Past history would not give us any great reason for tremendous optimism in this line. However, it is something that I have worked on for years. I know that the war in Europe was scarcely over before I was pleading for some kind of arrangements among the great powers of the earth so that these fears and burdens could be lifted from the backs of men, and particularly once we had found out that the atomic bomb was in existence. Now, as of today: my views, I must say, have changed very little, if at all, since that time. We must have ways and means of determining that each principal nation party to any kind of agreement is acting in good faith. There must be ways and means of determining that; and once we can determine and make certain, have confidence in the ways and means that this is to be done, then as far as we are concerned we would like to put everything in the pot and go just as far as anybody else would.

Q. Mr. Roberts: Mr. President, may I ask further in that connection, there have been suggestions studied here and elsewhere that there might be a sort of an interim set of agreements to ban further tests of thermonuclear weapons. Has that been brought to your attention, and could you comment on it?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, yes, it has been brought to my attention. We have discussed pro and con. We see nothing of an ad interim nature about this. If this would come about, naturally, if we could get a decent and proper disarmament proposal, I see nothing to be gained by pretending to take little bits of items of that kind and deal with them separately.

Q. Alan S. Emory, Watertown Times: Sir, could you tell us the difference between cutting $ 1.4 billion in taxes for fiscal 55 and not cutting the taxes for fiscal '56? I believe that the deficit of

the current fiscal year minus the tax cut gives approximately $3.2 billion, and the estimated deficit for fiscal '56 plus the tax cut for half of that year under the Democratic plan would also come to $3.2 billion.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I don't know about '56. I know this, that the actual effect for a full fiscal year under this proposal is something on the order of $2.3 billion. Now, after all, these tax programs and things that are needed to bring confidence to American business and the American consumers are long-term problems, not things that look attractive at the moment because, you say, "we will only go in debt a little bit more next year." I am talking about a long-term, sound fiscal program for the United States. And remember this: when we talk about these things, as far as I am concerned, I am not talking about any partisan advantage of any kind. I am not talking about a personal attitude. It is not I that may be defeated. What we are talking about here is 163 million people and what is good for them, how they are going to prosper, how they are going to grow constantly stronger and have a better life. That is what we are talking about. The Government owes it to every citizen to live as economically as it can, to cut down expenditures, to keep working on it, and intelligent people ought never to give up on this. But when we get down to that point, let us by no means live beyond our income, because if we do, we will damage ourselves irrevocably.

Q. Raymond P. Brandt, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: Mr. President, can we interpret that to mean that there will be no tax reduction until the budget is balanced?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I don't know that you could make such an interpretation. For example, last year we gave a tax reduction in the belief that that particular tax reduction, worked out carefully, would help in the long run to balance the budget. I believe you can anticipate savings; I believe you can anticipate certain good results from things that you do, administratively and otherwise. Certainly you want to return taxes, because I assure you, every political party likes to cut taxes; there is no question about that. So we will do it as soon as we can, and I would not say by any manner of means that the budget has to be in perfect balance before you can contemplate sincerely another tax cut.

Q. Mr. Brandt: One other question, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Q. Mr. Brandt: Does that mean that a balanced budget is not in sight at this time?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, a balanced budget--I believe I quoted to you from one of my favorite authors, myself, not long ago. [Laughter] I read to you a statement I made in '52, I think, that I believed that within 4 years, with careful administrative procedures, with businesslike methods, with examining every expenditure and arranging our tax program, reforming it, we could achieve a balanced budget within 4 years and at a rate of taxation bearable by the American people. I still believe that, if we do it logically and sensibly.

Q. William Theis, International News Service: Mr. President, do you share the hope expressed by Sir Anthony Eden that there might be at least discussion and possibly settlement of the Formosa problem at the Bangkok Conference?

THE PRESIDENT. I didn't see his statement, but the United States is, and this Government is,

on record as seeking every possible means for a cease-fire with justice to everybody in that region.

Q. Mr. Theis: Could you say, sir, whether the Secretary of State went with any special instructions on that matter to Bangkok?

THE PRESIDENT. AS you may know, the Secretary of State and I, just before he left, had half a dozen conferences. This subject, of course, was talked at great length, and his plan for having conversations with Mr. Eden and others concerned was very clear and definite. But exactly what could be done, we had no prognostications, you might say, as to outcome.

Q. Charles E. Shutt, Telenews: Would you comment, sir--I know Congress has not been in session too long--as to the harmony in relationship with the Democratic-controlled Congress and your office?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, on a personal basis and meeting with these individuals, it is completely satisfactory. Every time I have asked any individual, any leader of the opposing party to confer with me, or he wanted on his own initiative to institute such a conference, it has been on the most friendly and, as far as I know, profitable basis possible.

Q. Clark R. Mollenhoff, Des Moines Register: Mr. President, in the past you have made it clear that you deplored the fact that certain members of Congress have attacked individuals unjustly on the floor, but you at the same time said that that was a matter for Congress to decide upon for itself. Now, I wondered what steps you would take if it should come to your attention that someone in the executive agency would call an individual a member of a subversive organization when they had no evidence to sustain that and it was absolutely clear that there was no evidence to sustain it.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, now, I am not a member of the Supreme Court, but I understand they don't answer these very long hypothetical questions. [Laughter] When you bring to me facts such as you just now allege, and bring them so that I can study them and not answer them in a press conference where I have nothing of any other side except a statement of accusation, then I will give you my opinion; but not now.

Q. Mr. Mollenhoff: Mr. President, is that an invitation to permit this--

THE PRESIDENT. If you have any information that you believe of wrongdoing in this administration, you are not only at liberty to submit any facts you have, I strongly urge that you do. I assure you they will get the finest kind of consideration.

Q. Frederick Kuh, Chicago Sun-Times: Mr. President, I would like to ask a question in view of our experience with EDC. What alternative have you in mind in the event of an inordinate delay or blockage in ratification and putting into operation of the Paris agreements?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I must answer the question in this way. As you know, these efforts have been going on now literally for years. At every stage, almost every day, anyone who had official position with respect to these plans--and as you know, I did in Europe before I came back here--had to have alternatives in mind, in part, or sometimes on a whole plan. Always, though, you keep these as a sort of insurance against any catastrophe such as you now again bring up as a

possibility. I strongly hope we won't have to consider any further alternatives. I do not regard this one to be as effective as was the concept of EDC. EDC had the great virtue of bringing about almost involuntarily and, you might say, as one of its corollaries, a greater unification of Western Europe. I must tell you, ladies and gentlemen, today I just cannotoveremphasize the importance to the security of the free world of a great economic, industrial, and social connection and indeed finally some greater and better political connection between the nations of Free Europe. They are a great power if united, 950 million highly educated people, a great productive capacity, great resources; but split up into contesting smaller governments and smaller economies, it is indeed failing to achieve the strength of which it is capable. So at this moment, this particular plan seems to be the best that can be accomplished, and I am going to put my full strength behind getting this one done. I will take up alternatives afterwards.

Q. Sarah McClendon, El Paso Times: Mr. President, for some reason there seems to be no channel of communications between your office and the office of Speaker Sam Rayburn of the House of Representatives. He says that every time there is a message from the President coming to the Congress that the press get it in advance but he doesn't hear it until it is on the floor; no copy is sent to him and he can't get a copy unless Charlie Halleck or Joe Martin bring him one.Then recently he has given out three statements publicly aimed at your office, and apparently your office has never received these statements and doesn't know. One was on Dixon-Yates and two were on the Flemming report on oil and gas. Is there some means--do you know this, and if you didn't know it, will you do something about establishing this channel of communications? [Laughter]

THE PRESIDENT. I doubt that the Speaker has to bring to me any complaints about my office through a roundabout course of communication. He and I have been personal friends for years. He is the representative of the district where I was born, indeed, and based on that there has been a sentimental attachment. He has been invited, as has every other Democratic leader, to bring to me anything by reaching for a telephone and calling me up, just exactly as any leader of the Republican Party has. So I cannot believe that he is disappointed or feels any sense of frustration about any lack of communication.

Q. Mrs. McClendon: Well, sir

THE PRESIDENT. That will be all I have to comment on that.

Q. Robert G. Spivack, New York Post: Mr. President, Senator Knowland said yesterday in a speech that he thought the U.N. could no longer be considered an effective instrument of collective security. I wonder if you could give us your evaluation of the work of the U.N. in recent years.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, of course, ladies and gentlemen, it would take a long time to go back through the entire history of the United Nations. I think I can best sum up my opinion about the need for the United Nations and about its work, about the reasons we should support it, in a very short simple analogy. We do not cease our efforts in research in cancer, nor do we abolish the laboratories in which this research goes on merely because of lack of success; and we have had a tremendous lack of success. Here is a laboratory where nations come together and they explore and they talk, and I am not even going to bother this morning to recite to you some of the good things they have done in the Mid-East and elsewhere. They have. But I must say, as long as we

have got a forum, regardless of the fact that our opponents do deliberately use it as a propaganda platform, it is a good thing to keep it going. Here is something for which mankind has had a yearning ever since the dawn of history, and I am not going to give up in my time on it.

Q. Edward P. Morgan, American Broadcasting Company: Sir, there seems to have been some confusion in the past about what the administration thought was necessary in terms of aid to Asia, particularly Southeast Asia--military, economic, and in technical assistance. Could you give us now, sir, at this point what you think should be done in that regard?

THE PRESIDENT. You are asking a question that has no final and definite answer. The situation in Asia changes daily, as it does everywhere else in the world. It is human. We have, as far as I know, never had real disagreement in any moment, at least what I call disagreement as to principle, in the whole administration. But there are changing situations. We had a war in Indochina. That war is not going on actively now. We have danger situations developing in a number of these weaker countries. We are constantly working and trying to deal with them on a case by case method, on the merits of each problem, in such a way as to advance the security and progress of the United States of America and her real friends in the free world. Now, that is what we are trying to do, and there is just no final answer at any one time.

Q. Charles S. von Fremd, CBS News: Mr. President, there has been a considerable amount of talk in the past 2 days over this tax matter, sir, among Republicans on Capitol Hill who accuse the Democrats of making this step as a political gesture rather than one where they are truly trying to help a good many people, and yesterday, after coming out of a conference with you in the White House, Congressman Arends said that it smacked of politics 100 percent. I wonder if that also represents your views or at least to a certain extent.

THE PRESIDENT. I think my record is perfectly clear on one point. I have often criticized here, in front of you people, ideas, plans, and programs. I think I have never challenged anybody's motives. If you are going to talk about motives, you will have to do it on your own responsibility or get someone else to talk.

Q. Louis C. Hiner, Indianapolis News: Mr. President, the Hoover Commission task force this week sent certain recommendations to Congress to cut the volume of Government paperwork. They recommended that you issue an Executive order to support a Government-wide paperwork management program. What are your feelings about their suggestion?

THE PRESIDENT. If they have found a practical way to accomplish something along this line, I am going to design some new type of medal for them--[laughter]--because I have been working on it a good many years, particularly in the Defense Department, but even in some other places where I have collaborated on a confidential basis. It is the hardest thing in the world, and particularly when there are so many growing reasons for every department of Government to get into some new function, to study some new idea, to prepare some new report. With all kinds of needs arising, it seems difficult to cut it down. But if they have found a practical way, they are going to find a very great ally in me. That I assure you.

Q. Garnett D. Horner, Washington Evening Star: Mr. President, could you tell us what you think the effect might be on the work of the Federal Communications Commission of its recent experience of having two witnesses change their testimony in the Edward Lamb case and charge

that FCC personnel had coached them into giving false testimony?

THE PRESIDENT. As a matter of fact, that has not come to me officially. I know about it; it has been brought up in conversation in my office. I will have to take a much closer look before I can express any kind of opinion whatsoever.

Q. Roscoe Drummond, New York Herald Tribune: Mr. President, would you give us your reaction to the size of the Republican vote against your trade bill in the House last week?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, Mr. Drummond, I should say this: I was, of course, highly gratified that in the final vote a majority of both parties went for the affirmative side of this bill. This is because I so deeply believe that the welfare of the free world, which so inescapably involves the welfare of the United States, is bound up in a growing volume of trade and trade traffic. Now, as to the other votes that were not final, there were, of course, times when there was a majority of the Republican Party on the other side. Exactly why these maneuvers were carried out I think puzzled even some of their own leaders. In conversations with them, they did announce themselves as puzzled.

Merriman Smith, United Press: Thank you

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I just want to say this one thing. [Laughter] I have only this one thing left, Mr. Smith, which is not news. I am grateful to the entire body of the Congress, as I said before, finally for looking at this thing in a statesmanlike way and trying to decide on the basis of what's good for all America. Thank you very much.

(44) Message to the Inter-American Investment Conference Held in New Orleans February 28, 1955 [Recorded on film.]

EL-Dl6-30 (IR)

MAY I first express a warm welcome to all of you at the Inter-American Investment Conference in New Orleans. Your conference is the kind of concrete "let's-see-what-we-can-do-together" demonstration that can make a valuable contribution to our hemispheric concept of "the good partner." I am particularly pleased that this conference has been organized by private businessmen of the Americas for the growth of private business between the Americas.

I do not mean that the Government of the United States can or should be uninterested or refuse to participate in inter-American economic development. Quite the contrary. There are and will be many opportunities for both direct and indirect Government participation--sometimes in partnership with private initiative; sometimes through the kind of stimulus which may be furnished by the operation of special tax inducements such as Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey referred to at the Rio Conference; sometimes through a device such as the International Finance Corporation designed to make increased development funds available and also provide for the eventual transfer of the project to private ownership.

But behind all private plans and projects, behind Government help, behind a New Orleans Conference or a Rio Conference, behind the words, the dollars, and the blueprints, there must exist the essential ingredient of faith--North American faith in Latin America, and Latin American faith in North America. And if today I had to choose only one thought to leave with

you, it is the thought of our North American faith in the future of Latin America--economically, culturally, politically, and spiritually.

Each of us in this Western Hemisphere is possessed of many blessings--compared to many other areas of the world. Compared to hundreds of millions of the world's people, our blessings are superabundant. Should we not, therefore, clasp hands in fraternal friendship, and so conduct ourselves that these blessings shall be multiplied for the good of all? And so to you conferees of the first Inter-American Investment Conference, I say with all my heart, may good fortune attend your gathering.

(47) President's Press Conference March 2, 1955

[President Eisenhower's sixty-second news conference was held in the Executive Office Building from 10:32 to 11:04am, in attendance: 188.]

EL-Dl6-62 (PC)

[This is a complete transcript of the news conference of this date. Those portions of the President's replies which were not released for broadcasting or direct quotation at that time are enclosed in brackets.]

THE PRESIDENT. Good morning.

There are two individuals I would like to mention this morning. The first, as to His Holiness, the Pope--his 79th birthday--a man that I have had the honor of visiting personally, admiring him greatly, and particularly because of his unbroken record of opposition to all forms of fascism and communism, I am quite certain that all America would wish this great spiritual leader a very happy day today, and many more of them.

The other man is Ambassador Caffery, just now retiring from the diplomatic service, who holds the American record for length of time as head of a mission. For 29 years he has been head of an American mission in some foreign country, has been responsible for solutions to many serious problems, or at least helpful, and leaves with a brilliant record and the best wishes of the entire Department.

The interesting life he has led, as described by him to me this morning in a short interview, would seem to me to provide some inspiration for able, young Americans to go into that same service, a service that is constantly devoting itself, dedicating itself, to the welfare of the United States all over the world.

Those are the only announcements I have; we will go to questions.

Q. Merriman Smith, United Press: Mr. President, Mr. Churchill said yesterday that Western superiority in the hydrogen bomb will prevent Russia from starting a big war within the next 3 or 4 years. Now, from this, or from your own sources of information, do you get the idea that Russia will pull even with the West in 3 or 4 years?

THE PRESIDENT. Anything dealing with such a subject, any conclusion, is really nothing more than a speculative estimate. However, we do know that the Western World has had and enjoyed a great lead in this whole field, both in atomic fission and atomic fusion. Now, exactly how long

that lead can be sustained is problematical. And again another factor enters this question: there comes a time, possibly, when a lead is not significant in the defensive arrangements of a country. If you get enough of a particular type of weapon, I doubt that it is particularly important to have a lot more of it. So I think that it would be unwise to attempt any fixed conclusions based on the information available to any of us.

James B. Reston, New York Times: Sir, I wonder if you could straighten us out on your economic foreign policy for Asia. About 3 months ago, Mr. Stassen and Mr. Dulles sought out the press to develop the thesis that our policy was out of balance, that we had to have a large new economic policy for Asia; then Mr. Humphrey seemed to knock that down; and now yesterday Mr. Stassen seems to have announced in New Delhi that you are sending a new program to the Hill next month.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, Mr. Reston, I think the things that you talk about as being indicative of a struggle within the administration are merely evidences of the long-term intensive study that has been taking place here. This is not an easy subject. We had a tremendous change in the Far Eastern situation over the past year--the cease-fire in Indochina, where we had been devoting a very great deal of money, as you know. Now, to take a new look at the situation of what is needed has involved a very long and earnest study, and in the meantime, SEATO has come into existence, so that, as far as I know, there has been no great differences in final conclusions. There have been different viewpoints presented, and there is evolving a plan soon to be crystallized that will be brought out to the Congress for its approval and for implementation; but that is as far as you can say anything definitely on the thing at this time. It will be one we hope will be helpful to all our friends in that area.

Q. Roland H. Shackford, Scripps-Howard: During the last week there has been published a suggestion, now supported by a resolution in the Senate, that the United States try to get all nations, including Russia, to agree to devote more of their resources to raising living standards, more butter and fewer guns. Could you give us your thoughts on the general idea by devoting, by giving higher priorities, to living standards, to have a form of economic disarmament?

THE PRESIDENT. I find here recently more and more occasions to refer to my favorite author. I think you might find the same idea in a speech I delivered, I believe, on April 16, 1953: that the United States could not be more devoted to the idea of the products of humans being devoted to human welfare and less to human destruction, than we now are. We believe in it thoroughly. Now, every one of these plans that is brought forward always has to make this one assumption: that there are ways and means available to us for making certain that everybody is acting in good faith. Good faith is the ingredient that must be implicit in any plan that is finally adopted, and which could gain the confidence of people who don't want to fight. We know we will never start an aggressive war. We just want to devote ourselves to the prosperity and the security, happiness and safety, greater liberty and development of our own people and of our friends in the world. I believe there can be a dozen different variations of a plan for disarmament if it is approached in good faith; and now that is the thing that we must seek, we must try to build. When you come down to it, possibly the best way to define American policy abroad in this whole field is how do we develop good faith among the nations so that all peoples can be confident in the words of others.

Q. Joseph C. Harsch, Christian Science Monitor: Mr. President, 2 weeks ago you discussed your

early postwar invitation to Marshal Zhukov to visit you, and you said at that time that you would be willing to consider renewing the invitation. Has there been any consideration of that, and if so, any result?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I have thought it over personally and, as of this moment, I am not going to issue one. I think there are a lot of things going on in the world. I am going to certainly wait until I discuss again with the Secretary of State conditions that have been developing over the past couple of weeks. But I repeat that in those days I liked him, I thought he was a very able man. From the personal standpoint, of course, it would be very interesting to see him again. It is something I have not forgotten, Mr. Harsch; I am just not ready to give the final answer on it.

Q. Fletcher Knebel, Cowles Publications: Mr. President, what do you think of the suggestion advanced out in Iowa, and now seconded very heartily by an official Soviet publication called "Soviet Agriculture" that a group of Russians come out to Iowa and see how we grow the tall corn and the hogs? [Laughter]

THE PRESIDENT. I think--and I believe I have told this before in front of this body--I think the Russian people, as such, don't want war any more than we do. They want opportunities to advance themselves economically, culturally, and, of course, traditionally Russians are very devoted to all the arts--their aesthetic sense seems to have been highly developed. Now, I couldn't imagine, if we could relieve this question of all of the inhibitions and the limitations that occur to you because of the situation today in the world, I couldn't imagine anything better than to have some of their agricultural people visit our agricultural people. I visited once both state farms and collective farms in Russia, and there was no place where I was queried so insistently and in such detail as I was on those farms. You know, they have a technical expert they call an agronomist for each one of these installations. The agronomist in one case was a woman; came up to me with a shining face, and just as eager to take the opportunity to ask questions, "How do you raise this?" Fortunately, I was raised in a farming area so I could answer some of the questions. [Laughter] "But how much does a person get in the United States for doing this kind of work?" "How do you do these things?" "I am so anxious to go see." I really believe this would be an area in which some good could come if we didn't have a dozen different difficulties of which we all know, one of which, I believe, is legal. We would have some difficulty in clearing things under our present laws. There are a number of things to be studied and looked at; but just as a personal opinion as to what good might come out of it, these two peoples, these two representatives of agriculture getting together, I would say it would be good and good only.

Q. Chalmers M. Roberts, Washington Post and Times Herald: Mr. President, I would like to ask a question about Formosa, since it has been about a month since the resolution that you requested was passed by Congress. Since that time, the Chinese Nationalists have evacuated some islands. Diplomatic negotiations appear publicly, at least, not to have brought any cease-fire. I wonder if it is a fair conclusion to draw from that, as the situation now is, the question of peace or war in Asia lies entirely with the Chinese Communists, or is anything or can anything more be done from our side?

THE PRESIDENT. I think the first answer to that is you never give up in the pursuit of a legitimate and desirable objective merely because you are defeated the first time and discouraged, and the conditions don't look particularly bright; you don't give up. Now, as to Formosa and the immediate estimate of the situation there, our Secretary of State is there today.

He is visiting with the Generalissimo and, by the time he comes back, certainly will have at least some new ideas or variations of ideas to put into our calculations. I should say, though, in general, that at least the Western World wants peace in that area; therefore, the only way that we can be embroiled is through some action on the part of the opposing side.

Q. Alan S. Emory, Watertown Times: Mr. President, this spring ground will be broken on a project that was the first new legislative accomplishment of your administration, the Saint Lawrence Seaway. Are there any chances that you will be up there for that ceremony, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. [I have been invited, and I have put it high on what I call my priority list of desirable things to do. But whether I will make it or not, I couldn't say at this time.]

Q. William H. Lawrence, New York Times: There have been reports, especially in South American countries, sir, that the real mission of the Atka in the Antarctic is to seek out some new proving grounds, either for atomic or hydrogen weapons. Can you comment on whether there is any truth in that or not?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, Mr. Lawrence, the report is absolutely without foundation. There is absolutely no intent on the part of the United States to go down into that area to explore for any such reason. The ship that went down there, this icebreaker, went down to do the preliminary logistic work for a scientific expedition, which will go down to do our part of what is called the world commitment in the development of the geophysical year of 1957-58. They are going down merely as a preparatory logistic exploration of how we will do our work. It will be done under scientists and for the development and benefit of the world, nothing else.[1]

[1]On March 28, a White House release stated that an expedition would be sent to the Antarctic in November to begin work on three observation sites in connection with U.S. participation in the program for the International Geophysical Year, July 1957 December 1958. The release further stated that plans for the IGY would lead to the establishment of more than 20 scientific stations on or near the antarctic continent. It also noted that the USS Atka, a Navy icebreaker, had just completed preliminary observations required for the later expedition.

On July 29 the White House announced on behalf of the President that he had approved plans for launching a small unmanned earth-circling satellite as part of the United States participation in the International Geophysical Year.

Q. Robert E. Clark, International News Service: Mr. President, the head of the Senate GOP Campaign Committee said the other day he doesn't think the Republican Party can win in 1956 without you as their candidate. I wonder how you feel about this view that you are indispensable to a party victory, and how it may affect your own plans in 1956?

THE PRESIDENT. Did you ever think of what a fate civilization would suffer if there were such a thing as an indispensable man? When he went the way of all flesh, what would happen? It would be a calamity, wouldn't it? I don't think we need to fear that.

Q. Sarah McClendon, El Paso Times: Sir, in the Northern District of Texas Court, where many tax cases arise, the Eisenhower Republicans and the Eisenhower Democrats are having quite a squabble over who is going to be the Federal judge. I wonder if you would support the man, who is Ralph Curry, who is supported by Jack Porter and the Eisenhower Republicans, or Bob Hall, who is supported by Senator Daniel and the Eisenhower Democrats?

THE PRESIDENT. [I am quite certain the Attorney General will bring to me the man he considers best qualified, the man who is, above all, supported by the American Bar Association and given a very high rating; and it wouldn't be anyone who is not qualified. Aside from that, I can't tell you.]

Q. Charles S. von Fremd, CBS News: There has been a bill introduced on Capitol Hill, sir, on the House side, suggesting or asking that the electoral college be abolished in determining presidential elections, and in its place the popular vote be substituted. Such bills have been introduced in the past, but they always have been defeated. However, the people who are for the popular vote point out that the electoral college in their mind is now outdated, and think in some cases a man with the minority of the popular vote could actually be elected President under the electoral college. Could you give us your views on this matter, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. [I am not so certain that a man couldn't argue both sides of this question; but this has been brought forward in various forms over a great many years, this same proposition. [I do want to point out one thing about our system: it tends to preserve a two-party system. If you took and made representations in Congress and, I suppose, it would be Congress as well as the President, based upon popular vote, you might begin to get proportionate or splinter parties as you do in other countries--if you made it just a single national thing. That I would deplore.

[But I would say this: while I think our system seems a little awkward and we can smile a little bit at it, it has worked. And while I believe it was at one time claimed that a presidential election was stolen due to the Louisiana vote being thrown out by party manipulation, on the whole it has operated very well. see no great reason, no great urgency, in changing it.]

Q. Raymond P. Brandt, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: Mr. President, will you comment on the action of the Senate committee yesterday in voting down the $20 tax reduction?

THE PRESIDENT. I was highly gratified. I explained my position on this whole tax proposition last week. I explained what I thought emphatically, even if rather sketchily--and I haven't changed my mind. Naturally, I am delighted that the Senate has brought out on the floor a bill that does keep on the books the excise and the extra 5 percent corporation taxes and, at the same time, doesn't go in for this reduction.

Q. Mr. Brandt: Did you read Mr. Keyserling's reply to your charges that the bill would bring on inflation?

THE PRESIDENT. [I read only three things someone brought in to my desk that said Mr. Keyserling has a plan for spending a good many more billion dollars, for reducing taxes, and balancing the budget at the same time. That I would doubt was a good economic plan.]

Q. Garnett D. Horner, Washington Star: Mr. President, I understood you to say, in discussing the question about Sir Winston Churchill's speech yesterday on the hydrogen bomb, that the Western World has had the lead in this whole field. Did you mean to put that in the past tense?

THE PRESIDENT. I didn't mean that it doesn't have it now. I mean that it has had, all this time, the lead. I did merely intimate that in such a thing as this, you couldn't say, looking on into the decades of the future, that this is always to prevail; that is all I meant.

Q. Elie Abel, New York Times: Mr. President, in an interview with Senator Margaret Chase Smith, Generalissimo Chiang Kaishek has said rather recently that he expects United States moral and logistical support for a reinvasion of the Chinese mainland. Can you tell us, sir, whether this Government has given the Nationalists any reason to expect such support?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I thought that this whole thing had been discussed so thoroughly there could be no question of America's attitude in this matter. The United States is not going to be a party to an aggressive war; that is the best answer I can make.

Q. Benjamin R. Cole, Indianapolis Star: Information has come from the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations that the States are all able to finance their own educational needs; and I was wondering, sir, if that had been brought to your attention, and if it is true, if it would change your views on the needs of the--the requirements of the States for Federal aid?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I doubt that that is true in detail. I hadn't heard that before, but I doubt it is true in detail, at least in view of information that comes to me from so many different sources. In any event, I believe the problem to be so serious that the United States Government must take a very positive and definite leadership in this direction. As you know, I am trying to make that leadership effective in a way that retains to the States and to the localities their traditional responsibility; but I do want to get going.

Q. Edward T. Foillard, Washington Post and Times Herald: This is another political question, Mr. President. We have some information on this, but it came to us secondhand from Chairman Leonard Hall. Would you, sir, as leader of the Republican Party, tell us how you feel about San Francisco as a convention city, about a late convention, and about a short and merry presidential campaign?

THE PRESIDENT. When they asked me about this selection of cities, I didn't know all of the technical details of television, switching it from one convention to another, or all of the other things that so engaged the attention of the committees. I said I knew the climate of the areas, and I liked that of San Francisco better than I did Chicago; that was my remark. Now, I don't know that the timing and the place has any great effect on the succeeding campaign. I doubt that it has. I rather think it is a good thing to shift around from one city to another. Really that is what I thought: instead of always going back to the same place, switch around in this country. It is a big country, and if the place can accommodate the members of the convention, why, let's go there once in a while.

Q. Marvin L. Arrowsmith, Associated Press: Mr. President, would you like to send any message to Vice President Nixon regarding his statement yesterday that he hopes you will seek reelection? [Laughter]

THE PRESIDENT. Did he say that? [Laughter]

Q. Mr. Arrowsmith: He did.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I'll tell you: as you people know, I have always expressed great admiration for Mr. Nixon. I think he is a splendid type of younger man that we want in government. On the comment he made, I will send him no special message. I probably will have something to say to him when I see him. [Laughter]

Q. John Herling, Editors Syndicate: Mr. President, as you know, sir, the A.F. of L. and CIO have signed an agreement to merge their organizations, more than 15 million members. Would you care, sir, to comment on its possible significance to the country, and its various ramifications; and, too, do you see in such a merger the danger of a labor monopoly?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, quite naturally, I have done a little speculating and thinking of my own on such an important question. I have asked people in the Government who can devote their whole time to this problem to give me their conclusions, and they will do so. My own mind will stay open on a lot of the facets of this particular movement and development. But, by and large, I think this: I think the American people, in their individualistic selves are very independent; and I would doubt that any organization can just set itself up and be, in all phases of their political and economic and cultural life, the bosses of any great number of Americans. I believe that there will be many counterbalancing factors in any attempt to make this just one great, say, political organism, or something of that kind, and these people be the bosses of that many Americans.

Q. Mr. Herling: Mr. President, do you feel there is such a tendency for them to be bosses over American workers who are members of unions?

THE PRESIDENT. Do I what?

Q. Mr. Herling: Do you feel there is any tendency in that direction?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I didn't comment on that. I merely said that you were proposing the question in terms of politics. Well, I believe these people are going to be fairly independent politically, as always.

Q. Daniel Schorr, CBS News: Mr. President, referring to your preference to the climate of San Francisco, can it be taken for granted that you will attend the convention?

THE PRESIDENT. NO. [Laughter]

Q. Merriman Smith, United Press: That is what I was going to ask.

Q. George R. Zielke, Toledo Blade: Mr. President, are you happy that Congress has decided to raise its pay and that of the judges?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, I am. In the past, ladies and gentlemen, I have talked to a number of what I thought promising young people, people who are establishing themselves, about the possibility of them getting into government; and I find that, particularly with respect to jobs that bring them to Washington, the economic factor has a very important bearing on their decisions. Frequently they must simply decline; because, they said, "I am a young fellow starting out, and I can't do it." They must keep a home in their own districts; they must go back often to those districts if they hope to be re-elected, and they have to be re-elected each two years--incidentally which, I think, is a mistake; I would like to see a 4-year term for them. Then they have to set up a new home here; and, as you know, they do have unusual expenses. Now, they voted themselves this raise, but they also included judges and other parts of the judiciary who have been badly underpaid. This administration has required, for example, that United States attorneys give up their private practices. They were allowed to do that in the past. We require them to give them up. They should be paid well. And of course, finally, you say they have given themselves a

$7,500 raise; we will get half of it back, don't forget that. [Laughter]

Q. Lawrence Fernsworth, Concord (New Hampshire) Monitor: Mr. President, last night I heard a very distinguished ex-Senator speak on this subject of pay raises. He suggested, he thought it would be a good idea to double the pay of a Senator, and he further put forth the suggestion that it would be a good idea for the Government itself to underwrite the campaign expenses of members of Congress. He thought that would be a great step forward toward eliminating corruption in these expenditures, and he set forth that notwithstanding the Corrupt Practice Act there still is a great deal of that sort of thing going on. Would the President care to give us his view on that?

THE PRESIDENT. [Well, that is a very broad and very wide question. I don't think I could comment on it usefully. I do applaud what must underlie his reasoning, and that is the effort to get good men to come to Washington, men that are dedicated to this country and will do their best in these places.]

Q. Kenneth M. Scheibel, Gannett Newspapers: Mr. President, getting back to the Russian food situation, has there been any final decision on the proposal that we give them some of our wheat?

THE PRESIDENT. I keep hearing about this proposal we give them some of our wheat, although I don't know where it came from. I believe there is an Attorney General opinion we may not barter, we may not sell, but we could give. Now, I want to point out that there has been no report made to us that Russia is really short of grain. On the contrary, within the last, I think, month, or very recently, they shipped three hundred and some thousand tons of grain out of the country.

The United States is never indifferent to human suffering, and in certain areas, as in the Danube area, just recently we put in $ 10 million worth of wheat, flour, and agricultural products. There is no purpose and no plan being studied at this time for sending any grain of any kind to Russia.

Q. Jay G. Hayden, Detroit News: Mr. President, in connection with this question of will you or won't you run again, at a press conference some weeks ago you commented that it was a rather large question, and that some time when you had plenty of time at a press conference you would discuss, I believe you said, the pros and cons. Could we make a date with you, sir, to start in on that at the next press conference? [Laughter]

THE PRESIDENT. I would doubt at the next press conference-[Iaughterl--but I'll tell you: if we can have a complete moratorium on it, I might make a date, let's say, a year from today. [Laughter]

Merriman Smith, United Press: Thank you, Mr. President.

(53) Remarks to the Students Attending the International School of Nuclear Science and Engineering, Argonne National Laboratory March 10, 1955 [The President spoke in the Rose Garden at 9:30am to students from 19 countries who were members of the first class attending the International School of Nuclear Science and Engineering. The School was inaugurated in March 1955 at the Atomic Energy Commission's Argonne National Laboratory at Lemont, Ill., as part of the atoms for peace program. The President's opening words referred to Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission.]

EL-Dl6-30 (IR)

Admiral Strauss and gentlemen:

It is a very great pleasure to have a part in welcoming you to America and to your entry in the Argonne School.

During World War II, we got into the habit of referring to ventures in terms of operations, Operation "This" and "That." In war, of course, it usually had a martial name.

I can't tell you how pleased I was to hear this project referred to as "Operation Friendship." That is exactly what we mean.

We want you to study in the friendliest of atmospheres, and go back to your country with the certainty that what you are carrying back is not only a new understanding in nuclear science and reactor engineering, but a new understanding of the friendship that all America feels toward each of your countries.

It will be a great personal favor to me if when you do go back, in addition to all of the things that you hope to accomplish in this new field, you will carry my personal greetings of friendship to everyone that you meet in your own countries.

Now, I have been told that Admiral Strauss and I are to have the privilege of shaking hands with each of you. As you go by, I would particularly like to have each of you give me your country's name as well as your own.

Good luck to each of you.

(56) President's Press Conference March 16, 1955

[President Eisenhower's sixty-third news conference was held in the Executive office Building from 10:31 to ll:0lam , in attendance: 212.]

EL-Dl6-63 (PC)

[This is a complete transcript of the news conference of this date. Those portions of the President's replies which were not released for broadcasting or direct quotation at that time are enclosed in brackets.]

THE PRESIDENT. I have no announcements, ladies and gentlemen, and we will go right to questions.

Q. Marvin Arrowsmith, Associated Press: Mr. President, are you worried any about the decline in stock market prices and, secondly, do you think the Senate Banking Committee study has contributed in any way to the decline?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, for the second part of your question, which I will answer first, I have no opinion whatsoever as to the effect of that particular investigation. What I do believe very thoroughly is this: we are trying to promote an expanding economy in this country, and one of the factors that is necessary in producing an expanded economy is confidence. So any group or any individual that undertakes to touch upon one of the points of our economy where this

confidence is affected, necessarily must proceed with great caution if he doesn't want to do unnecessary damage. I don't know of any particular phase of this investigation that hasn't been conducted in that way; certainly, some of the things that have come out of it have been reassuring. The conduct of our stock markets on the whole looks to be very satisfactory. I am not only concerned with a drop on the stock market, but any drop in an agricultural price or any other unexplained drop in the prices of parts of our products is of concern to the Government.

Q. Pat Munroe, Albuquerque Journal and Salt Lake City Deseret News: Mr. President, there is a war over water, that is, the Colorado River water, now in progress in the West between southern California and the Rocky Mountain States; and in your state of the Union message you urged Congress to approve a plan to conserve water in the Rocky Mountain States. Is this still your feeling, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. [Yes. But before I answer the question, let me say this: I don't like the use of that word "war." Let's try to avoid that word. Now, of course, it is part of my policy. I believe that water is rapidly becoming, if it is not already, our most precious natural resource. I believe we have got to take measures to save this water at the proper places. It is not all done in the same way. I believe the Agriculture Department, in its upstream conservation practices, has just as much responsibility in the matter as does the Interior Department with these great dams in the mountains. I might refer you to a book that has recently been printed, one called "Big Dam Foolishness." It is by a man named Peterson, who has apparently put in a life study on this. I have read his book. He undertakes to show that many of our big dams have been constructed under a very false conception.However, this whole question of water is important, not only to California and to Arizona and the western slope, but to the whole region, east as well as west.]

Q. Mr. Munroe: Well, sir, southern California has blocked our plan in the Rocky Mountain area with a legal suit before the Supreme Court, and as recently as yesterday, Budget Director Hughes indicated a very firm support for the Upper Colorado plan.

THE PRESIDENT. [Well, I don't know about the Supreme Court; if it is before the Supreme Court, I know I am not going to comment on it. But as far as my concept of what is necessary, it has not changed; I still believe the same as I said in my state of the Union message.]

Q. Merriman Smith, United Press: Mr. President, with no effort to violate your desire for a moratorium on the subject, do you agree with Vice President Nixon that the Republican Party is not strong enough to win re-election in 1956 without you? [Laughter]

THE PRESIDENT. I thought you were really observing that agreement on a moratorium until you got to your last two words. I would say this, first of all: as you know, I have been responsible for various kinds of fights in my lifetime. I have never yet gone into any fight with as much strength as I should like to have. The more strength you have, the more certain that you are of victory, then the more certainly you can plan your moves. Now, I agree that the Republican Party needs strength, needs recruits. I come back to the same old thing I have repeated to you people time and time again: in spite of all the publicity gimmicks, all of the shrewd recruiting systems, there is one thing that will bring Republican Party recruits--fine programs for the benefit of all America and real work in putting them over. That is the kind of thing that will certainly bring Republican Party strength, and it will be strength enough to win with anybody that is worthy of a place.

Q. Charles S. von Fremd, CBS News: Mr. President, yesterday at his news conference, Secretary of State Dulles indicated that in the event of general war in the Far East, we would probably make use of some tactical small atomic weapons. Would you care to comment on this and, possibly, explain it further?

THE PRESIDENT. I wouldn't comment in the sense that I would pretend to foresee the conditions of any particular conflict in which you might engage; but we have been, as you know, active in producing various types of weapons that feature nuclear fission ever since World War II. Now, in any combat where these things can be used on strictly military targets and for strictly military purposes, I see no reason why they shouldn't be used just exactly as you would use a bullet or anything else. I believe the great question about these things comes when you begin to get into those areas where you cannot make sure that you are operating merely against military targets. But with that one qualification, I would say, yes, of course they would be used.

Q. Matthew Warren, Du Mont Television: Mr. President, in view of the devastating effects of our modern thermonuclear weapons and the secrecy surrounding their development, how do you think we can maintain an adequate civilian defense?

THE PRESIDENT. Of course, you are touching one of the most serious problems facing us today, and it is all the more serious because it is one of those facts that human beings just rather recoil from looking squarely in the face, do not like to do it. Not long ago, the Atomic Energy Commission published a rather long paper giving a considerable amount of information on the effects of thermonuclear weapons and, particularly, the fallout. The purpose of it was to show that while it is known that downwind from these things you can get a long area in which there could be very serious consequences, it is also possible for the individual to take care of himself. It was intended, given the proper amount of work the man will do, to be reassuring and not to be terrifying. The great chore you have here is to give people the facts, show them what they can do, get the Federal leadership, get the participation of the States and the municipalities, without terrifying people. I have one great belief: nobody in war or anywhere else ever made a good decision if he was frightened to death. You have to look facts in the face, but you have to have the stamina to do it without just going hysterical. That is what you are really trying to do in this business.

Q. Alan S. Emory, Watertown Times: Mr. President, two questions, sir: could you tell us the purpose of Governor Dewey's visit with you after our conference this morning; and, second, the Chief Justice of the United States recently, in a speech in St. Louis, said that he did not think the Bill of Rights, if proposed today, would pass. I wondered if you cared to comment on that?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I fail to see much relationship between your two questions. [Laughter] As to the first one, I haven't the slightest idea. Governor Dewey asked to see me, and the date was set up; he is coming in. Now, the second one, I never heard such a statement made. You say the Chief Justice of the United States said this?

Q. Mr. Emory: Yes, sir.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I have got a tremendous admiration for him and for his mind, and I am certain that he has thought over wall what he had said. But I would say this: if it were up for passage today, I would be one of those out campaigning for its adoption. That is about all I can

say.

Q. John Herling, Editors Syndicate: Mr. President, this has to do with the expanding economy you referred to earlier.

THE PRESIDENT. With the what?

Q. Mr. Herling: The expanding economy--that you are concerned with. As you know, there is much concern in labor and management circles about the impact of automation on our human and economic relations; and since automation does affect every part of our national life, the question has been raised as to whether a Presidential commission might undertake a study of its impact and ramifications; and would you give us some idea of what your thinking is on the subject of automation. Second, would you consider the possibility of supporting such a commission to aid the country in facing the problems growing out of automation?

THE PRESIDENT. [Well, let's be quite clear. I would not attempt to give a specific answer to a specific question that you asked; on a spur-of-the-moment attitude or circumstances, it would be foolish for me to do so. This matter of automation--another word that has now arisen to plague us some--has been discussed habitually by my economic advisers, by others in the administration, and naturally I have listened and read on the subject. The one striking thing you should remember is this: exactly the same thing has been going on for a hundred and fifty years; exactly the same fears have been expressed right along; and one of the great things that seems to happen is that as we find ways of doing work with fewer man-hours devoted to it, then there is more work to do. I believe that it would be false to assume that the amount of work we are going to have to do is going to remain static, when we are looking for an expanding economy. It is going to expand. The work to do is going to expand not only in, you might say, arithmetic progression, along with the amount your economy expands, but there are other things to do because man will have other needs and other desires and want things to use. So I really believe that my own feeling is that the danger is often exaggerated. On the other hand, I certainly will hope and will expect that the proper agencies of Government continue earnestly their investigations on this subject, their watch on the development; and if any danger seems to be appearing upon the horizon that is unforeseen, then it is possible that even a commission would be the right answer. But I couldn't say now.]

Q. Marshall McNeil, Scripps-Howard: Mr. President, I have two questions about an old one. The Dixon-Yates contract is apparently tied up in the courts, and a majority of the TVA Board has lately asked you again for appropriations for the Fulton steam plant. I wondered whether that would prompt you, sir, to reconsider the problem of power in west Tennessee; and, the second question, would the construction of a plant, generating plant, by Memphis itself not fit into your philosophy, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I know of no reason--to take your second question first--I know of no reason whatsoever that Memphis hasn't a complete right to manufacture or set up any producing plant it wants to. Certainly I would favor it. I have nothing at all against local ownership of power. I think in many cases it is not only a good thing; in some cases it has been proved to be very effective. But there is one thing I always want to point out to you people when I talk about governmental authority, responsibility and operation. Don't forget this: when the Federal Government does this, they can print money to do the job. Nobody else can, and there is a very

great difference; because the second that the Federal Government starts to print money to do these things, they are taking one cent, or at least their proportion, out of every dollar that any of you might happen to have in your pockets. That is the effect of cheapening money, and I don't think we ought to go in for that. Now, as to the review of this case, it has not come up to me in any way in that form, and I don't know whether there is any reason for review or not. But I do say: for anything that falls within the State or city authorities, I have no objection to their doing it, whatsoever.

Q. Raymond P. Brandt, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: Mr. President, there seems to be some confusion about your position about allowing a person to be confronted with his accuser in a governmental case. The Department of Justice says that when you said a man shall be entitled to be confronted with his accuser, he should know who it was, and so forth. They said that was only for criminal cases. I got the idea it was for the security cases, also.

THE PRESIDENT. NO, I believe there are certain cases, Mr. Brandt, where you couldn't possibly bring out all of your accusers, for the simple reason that you may work for a number of years to get people in places where they can look for these things that, by their very nature, are destructive of the United States system and of the welfare of the United States of America. Now, those people you cannot destroy. If in the course of their operations they bring up information, remember this: you are not determining anything about the legal rights or the application of the Bill of Rights to this man's case. What you are trying to determine is, is he fit to work for the United States Government? Should you take the responsibility of saying, in spite of the fact that we cannot put the man, the accuser, up in front of this man and let him cross-examine, should we continue him in a sensitive position? I do believe this: I do believe that we are going to be able to do more in finding nonsensitive areas in which to place such people.

Q. Mr. Brandt: On that point, sir, some of these accusers have been proved to be doing it for money and for other reasons.

THE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Q. Mr. Brandt: Now, the accused has no way of knowing whether the charges have been made in good faith.

THE PRESIDENT. Mr. Brandt, I know that any honest person charged with the responsibility for protecting the interests of the United States and the Federal Government, would be the last to say that any system you can devise here is going to be perfect. Indeed, I don't believe that probably any lawyer would say that the judicial and the criminal procedures that we have in our country are perfect. We try to get them as nearly just as we can, and we do apply the Bill of Rights. Now, in the Federal Government, in putting a man to work for the Federal Government and paid by the Federal Government, there is a slightly different problem, though, than whether you are accused of cheating your neighbor or doing something else. It is, simply, you have got to do the best you can in these conflicting considerations; but, as far as you can, as far as is humanly possible without violating the security of the United States, to obey and to follow the Bill of Rights, that is what must be done.

Q. Mr. Brandt: May I ask one point on that? You said there are some plans now for the nonsensitive positions.

THE PRESIDENT. I say we think we can do better.

Q. Mr. Brandt: On the nonsensitive positions?

THE PRESIDENT. We always have had this; it is simply a question of operating just as well as we can.

Q. Garnett D. Horner, Washington Star: Mr. President, some weeks ago a report was published that the thermonuclear device that was exploded in the Pacific a year ago was a super-H-bomb with a jacket of natural state uranium that gave it greater power at less cost. Could you tell us if that was correct, and anything else about the development of the so-called bargain basement U-bomb?

THE PRESIDENT. [Well, I will tell you, you are asking technical questions about this bomb, and while I possibly could give you a fairly accurate answer, I think it would be unfair to ask me to give you one that you could write about. [I say this: you go ask Admiral Strauss about it, because he will give you every piece of information that is in the public domain. I don't think I should attempt to answer it.]

Q. Charles E. Shutt, Telenews: Mr. President, two people in your administration have mentioned the possibility of war, impending war, in Asia.

THE PRESIDENT. What is that? Mentioned what?

Q. Mr. Shutt: Admiral Radford said last night in a speech that there was a distinct possibility that war could break out at any time. Secretary Dulles also said that he came back from his visit with a sense of foreboding. Could you give us your views about the possibility of a conflict in the Far East, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, of course, you have to answer that one in generalizations. Why do we keep any kind of security forces? Because there is always a possibility of war. We are living in a time when it would be foolish to say that it is characterized by normal serenity, the kind of peaceful relations which we hope for among nations of the world. Therefore, the possibility is greater than, we would say, that we were raised with--that is, any of you if, unfortunately, you are as old as I am. We were raised in an atmosphere of complete confidence; there was no thought of war, and our military forces fell away to very, very small numbers. And if you read a little bit of the history of the Spanish-American War and the opening of World War I, you will see that is true. So the possibility is greater now than it was in those days; consequently, there is greater vigilance required of us, greater concern, greater diversion of our man-hours and our resources to the making and keeping and sustaining of armed forces than there would be otherwise. That is one of the reasons, of course, that the great policies of any enlightened nation must be the producing of conditions that will be more peaceful.

Q. Mr. Shutt: Would you say, sir, that we would be prepared for any eventuality in that area?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, again, you want specific answers for something that, it seems to me, you yourself should know. You prepare in the generality, and you can't tell what kind of a surprise might be prepared for you in any part of the world. But you are striving, and again I quote it to you, for what Washington called "that respectable posture of defense that is consonant

with the times in which we live," the kind of weapons, the kind of possibilities that we face. That is the best answer I can give you.

Q. Dickson J. Preston, Cleveland Press: Mr. President, the Olympic Committee of the Western Hemisphere Nations have just voted to hold the pan-American games in 1959 in Cleveland. This will be the first time they have been in the United States; and they will bring athletes from all the Americas to this country. I wondered if you would comment on that, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, that is the kind I like to comment on. [Laughter] I am not only highly gratified, but I will tell you, if I am alive and healthy, I would hope to attend.

Q. Mr. Preston: Thank you.

Q. Sarah McClendon, El Paso Times: Mr. President, there seems to be some confusion in the minds of people in the gas industry about a letter written by Mr. Morgan of your staff to Congressman Glenn Davis in which Mr. Morgan implies that the Flemming report on gas is not necessarily your views, but it is the views of your Cabinet advisers. Would you clear up, would you comment on that?

THE PRESIDENT. Certainly. The Advisory Committee has prepared their views and submitted them to me; there has been no action on my part at all, giving it final approval.

Q. William S. White, New York Times: I wonder if you would care to comment, sir, on the action of the Senate on the tax bill of yesterday?

THE PRESIDENT. Would it be allowable to just say "Hurrah!" [Laughter]

Q. Alice F. Johnson, Seattle Times: Mr. President, on September 17, 1950, the Denver Post quoted you as telling a Denver audience that quick admission of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood would show the world that America practices what it preaches, and that you hoped Congress would pass the statehood legislation then before it. Can you please tell us, one, what has happened in the meantime to change your mind about Alaska and, two, are there any circumstances Under which you Would favor giving Alaska statehood now?

THE PRESIDENT. When did you say I was quoted that way?

Q. Mrs. Johnson: September 17, 1950, when you were--

THE PRESIDENT. 1950?

Q. Mrs. Johnson: Yes.

THE PRESIDENT. I think I have explained my position with respect to Alaska in front of this group time and again. I think there are national security considerations which must be amply catered for before I can remove my objections to the statehood of this area. Now, I have never said anything against statehood for Alaska if those things are taken care of, and I have tried to explain in general what they were. Nothing has occurred to change that. At the time in 1950 when I said that, I was not responsible at that moment for the national security of the United States. I didn't bear the responsibility I do now. Now, I don't mean to say that I have changed my mind. I still think that any territory of the United States has got a right to strive to achieve the

standards normally accepted for statehood, but we have got a very, very difficult, tough problem up there. As I say, my position has been stated in front of this body several times.

Q. Joseph Chiang, Chinese News Service: Mr. President, under your great and distinguished leadership, does the United States Government have any plan to help 13 million overseas Chinese who are willing to make every sacrifice to go back home in the mainland of China to liberate their loved ones from the Chinese Communist enslavement?

THE PRESIDENT. [Well, I will simply say this: the problem is often spoken of; I have heard of no particular suggestion for solution of it. But I do know that you have all these overseas Chinese. I at this moment wouldn't know the answer, I admit.]

Q. Richard L. Wilson, Cowles Publications: Mr. President, there seems to be some special circumstances coming up in the automobile industry which would justify asking you if you have any position on the guaranteed annual wage.

THE PRESIDENT. As you know, this administration has several times urged the extension of unemployment insurance and tried to lead the States into making this system such that we don't have local distress in these great areas, so often affected by unemployment. But when you come to talking in the exact terms of the guaranteed annual wage, I don't know in what form it will appear. I don't know what will be demanded; and, therefore, I would prefer not to talk about any specific proposal until it has been presented and gone over by the Secretary of Labor and my advisers. Then I would have something to say about it. But I do believe in the extension of unemployment insurance.

Q. Milton Friedman, Jewish Telegraphic Agency: Sir, will you ask the Attorney General to draft recommendations to activate and implement your request in the state of the Union message to revise the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act?

THE PRESIDENT. [Well, I made the recommendation to Congress. Whether there is any other step that is necessary I will have to look up and see whether I should--

Q. Mr. Friedman: Sir

THE PRESIDENT. [I said I made the recommendation in the state of the Union message.]

Q. Robert Roth, Philadelphia Bulletin: Mr. President, if I may refer for a moment to the civilian defense question that was asked before, at a hearing before the Senate Armed Services subcommittee last week, Mayor Joseph Clark of Philadelphia made this statement, I am quoting: "Until the President himself takes a far more active part in formulating and carrying into effect a sound national civil defense policy, our major American cities will continue vulnerable to enemy attack." I wonder if you would comment on that assertion?

THE PRESIDENT. [Well, any city, of course, is always going to be vulnerable; it is the degree of. vulnerability that is necessary. [Now, this is somebody's opinion, apparently, of what I should do; I have got many opinions of what everybody else should do. But I am trying to do my duty. If he sees it differently, why, I would be glad to have his advice.]

Q. Lloyd M. Schwartz, Fairchild Publications: Mr. President, the Attorney General's Special

Anti-Trust Study Group has just recommended the repeal of the Federal laws which give these State fair trade laws their antitrust immunity. I wonder whether you could tell us whether you agree with his finding, and whether you intend to send appropriate repeal legislation up to the Hill?

THE PRESIDENT. [Well, no, I haven't heard of it; but you know, in the Justice Department you have these special sections for all these various functions of the Justice Department. That particular section is headed up by Justice Barnes, who is supposed to have one of the finest legal minds in this whole business. [Eventually this recommendation will come to me, but I hadn't heard of it before.]

Q. Edward T. Folliard, Washington Post and Times Herald: Mr. President, this question goes back to a news conference on February 23d. A reporter, Clark Mollenhoff of the Cowles Publications, asked you a question, and the sense of it was this: What would you do if a Government official called an employee a Red, and had no evidence to back it up? You invited Mollenhoff to submit proof, in fact, you urged him to do it. Mollenhoff then wrote you a letter in which he cited the case of Wolf Ladejinsky. Have you any comment to make on that case now?

THE PRESIDENT. [Only, So far, this: all the individuals now, I believe, that were involved in the case have come back; and aside from the recommendations of the Attorney General to prevent such cases from arising in the future, which have been published as instructions to the executive department, what's to be done in the particular case is still under investigation. A final report has not been made.]

Merriman Smith, United Press: Thank you, Mr. President.

(58) Remarks at llth Annual Washington Conference of the Advertising Council March 22, 1955

[The President spoke in the District Red Cross Building at 11:30am.]

EL-Dl6-31 (IR)

I THINK this is about the shortest introduction I have ever had.

One of the continuing problems of government, of course, is how to keep in touch with the grass roots, how to get into the understanding of the last citizen, in the remotest hamlet, the things that he should know about his government, so that he can make intelligent decisions, and how conversely, government is to know what those people are thinking. So, if nothing else, you can detect when there is a misunderstanding of facts or, indeed, maybe just a failure to have the facts that government could provide.

Among all the agencies that have served a useful purpose in this regard, none has been more effective than this agency--the Advertising Council. Your accomplishments are referred to constantly in the circles of the administration, and always in terms of the greatest admiration and respect, and a feeling of obligation for what you are doing.

I want to make this very clear because some of the things I would like to talk about may intimate that I think you have been guilty of some failures. I don't mean it in that sense either. But I do

mean that I believe there is a tremendous opportunity for all Americans in certain fields. Of all the people who are capable of taking advantage of those opportunities, this body by its past record would seem to be among the foremost.

I don't think it is necessary to point out that life has become intricate. And here at home, among the intricacies of living, the intricate relationship that each individual has toward his government and toward his community and everything else, has been one of the reasons why we have necessarily had educational bodies of which this is one.

But when we enter the international field we run into complexities that seem almost to dwarf our understanding of what we are doing to ourselves when we accept, let us say, paternalistic gifts of the government, without understanding for that we may be surrendering some of our ancient liberties.

Today there is a great ideological struggle going on in the world. One side upholds what it calls the materialistic dialectic. Denying the existence of spiritual values, it maintains that man responds only to materialistic influences and consequently he is nothing. He is an educated animal and is useful only as he serves the ambitions--desires--of a ruling clique; though they try to make this finer-sounding than that, because they say their dictatorship is that of the proletariat, meaning that they rule in the people's name--for the people.

Now, on our side, we recognize right away that man is not merely an animal, that his life and his ambitions have at the bottom a foundation of spiritual values. Now this--these facts seem to make it very odd that we fear the inroads that communism is making in the capture of the minds and souls of men.

They are, too. They are winning great adherents in many areas of the world. And we wonder why. And then we say, "But we are the ones that glorify the human; our doctrines ought to appear to the man in Burma or in Viet-Nam or Formosa or Mid-Africa, or the Middle East."

Something is happening. And we are not presenting our case very well. Now we do know that, of course, man has his materialistic side, and his physical side, and there has got to be a decent, materialistic basis for the development of his culture, his intellectual capacity, and the attainment of his spiritual aspirations. So we can't neglect that; we neglect it at our peril. It is in that field that we have got to meet our enemy very successfully.

For example, as we try to hold together the free world and try to lead it to cooperate spontaneously in its opposition to communism, we develop methods by which each country--each nation--and each individual, indeed, if we can bring that about-can achieve a continuous rise in his living standards to achieve that physical state of well-being, where these other things can occupy his attention and lead him on to a more solid partnership with a country such as ours.

So we develop a trade plan. Now a trade plan, my friends, is not just an altruistic method to open markets to the access of people all over the globe. Like all other foreign policy, its genesis is the enlightened self-interest of the United States. But it is in recognition of this fact, that if the United States itself is to prosper, it must have means by which it can sell its products and therefore it has to buy others.

But on top of that, it is a means of leading the free world to an understanding that this physical,

intellectual, spiritual being, man, can cooperate under this kind of system effectively and to his greater advancement, rather than to surrender to the blandishments of communism.

Now these are complicated subjects. When we talk about these principles, they have a different application in every subject, in every nation, indeed they have a different application in every sector of our own country.

But it would be fatal, in my opinion, here at home to allow the accumulated minor objections of each district or of each industry, because of real or fancied damage, to an enlightened trade policy, to defeat us in this great purpose of the economic union--a legitimate economic union of the free world in order that it may cleave to these great spiritual truths, which in turn make it a unity in opposing communism.

What I am trying without benefit of developed argument, is to express to you what is in my heart and mind, to convince you that, valuable as your work is at home--as much as it must be continued in combating those who are losing confidence and faith in our country--that we must undertake the task of laying before the people of the world the facts of today's life. Those are the facts of today's struggle, and the ways and means by which we may all cooperate to the greater security of all, and to the greater prosperity of all.

To say that the solution of such a problem can be accomplished without acute pain being suffered here and there, or by some locality or by some group, would be completely silly. Of course, there is going to be pain in every cure. There is pain to the operation that restores usefulness to a broken leg, or any other kind of operation. We are not going to do any of these things without a price. But if we understand ourselves what we need to do in the world to advance our own interests, economically and from the standpoint of security, to achieve and maintain the values that we see in private enterprise--understanding how that means communion and trade with other countries--then we can undertake the task of helping others to understand it also.

It is a very subtle job, I should say. The United States cannot be in the position of just preaching to others and say, "See how successful we are. Now you just get on the bandwagon and do the same way and you will have the same results." Everybody has got to take these great principles and interpret them in his own way, applying things in his own way to his own task. Otherwise it would not be freedom, and it would not be the kind of decision in which we believe. We believe that everybody should, so far as possible, decide for themselves.

Now this is what I honestly am convinced of: that unless we make it possible, through enlightened methods, for the free world to trade more freely among the several parts of that free world, we are not going to win the ideological battle. I do not expect us to fail in this process. But I do believe that every American, dedicated to his own country and proceeding from that place, can be helpful if he tries (a) to get his fellow American to understanding what is really going on in the world, and (b) to get others to understand it without necessarily preaching at them.

I am not pleading for any special form or any special detailed method of doing this. Groups such as this have great staffs. You dig out the facts. You put them together. From those facts you draw reasonable conclusions and then you take those conclusions as the basis of a plan that you start

out to place before others and get them to accept it.

So I am really pleading for an intelligent look at the great world today. How quickly you will find that every problem in the great world affects us at home. We cannot escape them. We are part of it. We are intertwined. Our future and lives, even our freedoms, may be intertwined with theirs. If we can work that one out, we can help the world forward in this kind of union, one that is based upon our great spiritual belief that man is a dignified individual and is not the slave of the state; that every man has a right to aspire toward intellectual advancement, cultural advancement, and with a decent economic base on which to do these things.

If we get to going forward in that concept and each doing his legitimate and proper part, there is no more chance for communism in the world than there would be for one of us to take off and fly to the moon without the aid of science.

So I came over here this morning, first, to say thank you very much for what you have done, and to say that in my belief what you can do is far greater than all you have accomplished in the past. I think I have met every year with this group. There is no group I would rather meet with. I believe in you. I believe in what you are doing. And I believe that, therefore, because you are so good, you can't put any limit, geographical or otherwise, on your work.

(59) President's Press Conference March 23, 1955 [President Eisenhower's sixty-fourth news conference was held in the Executive office Building from 10:31 to 11:04am , in attendance: 211.]

EL-DI6-64 (PC)

THE PRESIDENT. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, I have one announcement and one comment to make before we go to questions.

The Secretary of Commerce is going to Europe in mid-April in the interests of promoting freer trade among the free nations, and while there, is going to attend at least five great industrial fairs at which will be exhibited, of course, products of American industry and the like. His detailed schedule can be obtained from the Secretary of Commerce.

The comment I want to make affects a question asked me last week.

Someone asked me a question--I have forgotten whom "quoting the Chief Justice as having made a statement to the effect that if the Bill of Rights were now put before the American people, would be the judgment of the Chief Justice that that would not be approved. And I asked this individual whether he was sure as to what the Chief Justice said. I must assure him he is mistaken. This so bothered me that although I stated here that I had the greatest confidence in the Chief Justice's judgment, patriotism, and dedication, that still--if that were an issue--I would go out, at least, and do my part to help get this Bill of Rights adopted. Actually, when we looked up the speech--and a copy is in Mr. Hagerty's office now where you can see it--he said that his faith in the good sense, the soundness of the American people, was such that if this were now put before the American people, he was sure it would be adopted. So, whoever the questioner was, I would like to assure him he was mistaken in the premise that he proposed. We will go to

questions.

Q. Robert E. Clark, International News Service: Mr. President, Senator George has proposed that the United States take the initiative in arranging a Big Four conference after the Paris accords are ratified, without waiting for a demonstration of good faith by Russia. Can you bring us up to date on how you feel about a Big Four meeting at the chiefs of state level?

THE PRESIDENT. Of course, you open up a subject that is really involved. However, I have said time and again there is no place on this earth to which I would not travel, there is no chore I would not undertake if I had any faintest hope that, by so doing, I would promote the general cause of world peace. Now, international meetings have a number of purposes, and one of them, let us not forget, is just sheer propaganda. Nevertheless, we must never abandon the hope that in some new conference some constructive step will be taken and start this weary world at last on the path that could lead hopefully and definitely toward a better agreement. I have, I believe, noted--and I think the State Department has--that at this time, while the Paris agreements are still unratified in certain countries, that it is best not to muddy the water, not to introduce any new subject. However, once that is done--and I am not going to speak about the matter of initiative, I do not believe that that in itself is particularly important--but I do believe there have got to be new exploratory talks. I think they would be taken up at first on a different level from the chief of state. You must remember that in this country the chief of state has different constitutional and other types of duties than the chiefs of state in most other countries. The head of a government abroad is spared many of the duties and responsibilities that here fall upon the head of the state. So this meeting at the summit, which we so often hear about, is not so simple for us as it might be for some other countries. So I believe that that out of the way, now from a position of strength--that is, moral and spiritual strength very greatly enhanced through this exhibition of unity--it probably would be time to begin the kind of exploratory talks that might lead to something constructive. Now, I have used as examples in the past the kind of thing I would regard as deeds that would show the good faith of Russia. I have never meant, and never intimated, that those deeds would be limited to the examples I gave. In a dozen different ways this might be done. And I repeat that this Government, as long as I am the head of it, is never going to be backward in seizing upon any kind of opportunity that will apparently advance this cause.

Q. Charles S. von Fremd, CBS News: At past conferences, sir, you have indicated that such good deeds, or deeds not words, on the part of Russia might be approving an Austrian peace treaty--

THE PRESIDENT. That is right.

Q. Mr. von Fremd: --or free elections in Germany, and a free and united Korea. Would you still hold to these deeds before such a Big Four meeting could take place?

THE PRESIDENT. I give them only as examples. There could be a dozen others, as I said just a few minutes ago. It doesn't necessarily have to be those two. Suppose, well, suppose the proposition that I made on December 9, 1953, [1] before the United Nations, were suddenly accepted, as far as you could see, in complete good faith. Instantly, you would start a conference on a technical and political level between the two countries that would necessarily be directed toward some kind of peaceful pursuits of mankind, and you would--no matter, we don't know how far it would grow. There could be another one.

[1]The President, on December 8, 1953, delivered to the United Nations an address entitled "Atomic Power for Peace."

There would be a deed, not words.

Q. Paul R. Leach, Knight Newspapers: Mr. President, has any thought been given to this Government to the admission or inclusion of Western Germany in such a conference?

THE PRESIDENT. Let me answer that in this way, which, possibly, is just not quite as direct as you would like it. This subject of what we may do is discussed at least twice a week between the Secretary of State and myself. Manifestly, we have talked time and again as to the possibility soon of including Western Germany in the conference that might take place. But, of course, I would assume that the very first ones would possibly be limited to the four, because, as quick as you add one, where is the limit to what you must add. And you don't want to kill the possibility of a constructive conference by putting down details or conditions in advance that, when you add on to them from the other side, would just make it an impossible situation. You see the logic of that move?

Q. Mr. Leach: Yes.

Q. Merriman Smith, United Press: Mr. President, do you have under consideration an actual conference on, say, the Foreign Minister or Secretary of State level?

THE PRESIDENT. No, no; not exactly--that would be untrue to say that. We do take this up, constantly discussing it among ourselves, frequently with one of our allies, just to keep the thinking on the same level so that if particular conditions, favorable conditions, arise, we can move ahead.

Q. Richard L. Wilson, Cowles Publications: Mr. President, I wonder if you would clarify one point in this respect: would the initial conference, if successful, be followed by a meeting of the heads of state, or should it be followed by the--

THE PRESIDENT. That depends, I would think, Mr. Wilson, on what was accomplished. If any significant thing were brought forward where the presence of the heads of state could give it a solemnity, possibly a promise of success not otherwise obtainable, as I say, I would go anywhere. And let me make one gratuitous remark here: I sincerely hope that this group, at least, will not try to put me, on this subject, in any partisan attitude. In this subject, I am as sincerely bipartisan and nonpartisan as I know how to be. I respect the opinions of everybody that comes in honesty to me on it, and I have no thought of building any kind of special viewpoint in this country in support of somebody else's viewpoint.

Q. James B. Reston, New York Times: Sir, in that regard, would you welcome, would you favor, taking Senator George and other representatives of the Congress to such a conference, if it were held?

THE PRESIDENT. Indeed, yes, if they should find it convenient and want to go. Some of these trips, you must understand, are anything but comfortable and convenient experiences, and it is entirely possible that they would prefer to be present only for some very significant thing. But I would tell you this: there would be no disposition to keep the thing secret from them. They would be invited.

Q. Chalmers M. Roberts, Washington Post and Times Herald: Is it correct to infer from what you said, sir, that your thinking is that when you mention starting with a Big Four meeting, that you are thinking essentially of a further meeting regardless of the level only on the German unification and the Austrian treaty question, or is it possible that a general East-West meeting might be on a larger pattern than that?

THE PRESIDENT. I have never inferred in any way that it would be limited to those two things. Those were simply quoted as evidences of Soviet good will and good faith that would open up the whole subject of all of our differences. Everything could come before such a conference. Now, I must tell you this: you will recall in about the summer of 1951, representatives of these four powers met in the Rose Palace in Paris, I think, for 4 months merely trying to agree on an agenda, which they never did; and the conference could not be held. Maybe you could go to a nonagenda conference; I would have no objection. What I am saying is, the things you are talking about are merely instances, already agreed upon in large part. And the Western powers made great concessions in Austria, completely accepted the Soviet viewpoint, but nothing was done on it.

Q. Mr. Roberts: May I ask a second point: Senator George, in his remarks on this matter, raised the possibility or suggested the possibility of meeting with the Chinese Communists as well as with the Soviet Union. Would you consider any meeting of that type either separately on Asian matters or together on world problems?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think at the present moment it is completely academic, because every suggestion that has been made of peace in the Far East to the Red Communists has been accepted only, from their viewpoint, as insults to them. I think it is completely academic; there is no use speculating on it.

Q. Edward P. Morgan, American Broadcasting Company: Sir, last week, Representative Walter of Pennsylvania severely criticized the Post Office Department for seizing copies of Izvestia and Pravda in the United States mail. Mr. Walter said that if he had his way about it, he would, on the contrary, have these papers translated into English and distributed to everybody so, as he put it, they could see how nauseating communism could be. Colleges, too, have protested that this ban has complicated their research.

THE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Q. Mr. Morgan: And it is reported that the CIA has had some difficulty in its own research thereby. Does this restriction have your approval, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, let's make clear this: I am not going to disapprove it with no more than I know about it in detail at this moment. But I will say this: ever since I found that war records-that is, military records--were hidden away and, apparently, we were going to keep them from the American people forever, I have been against censorship. I don't like censorship, and I don't know the reason for this one. It hasn't been brought yet to my attention except through the newspapers. And, unfortunately, I haven't had a chance to look into it. I don't know what it is about, really.

Q. Daniel Schorr, CBS News: Mr. President, in view of all you have said this morning about the possibility of a Big Power meeting, I am somewhat confused about the remark of Senator

Knowland yesterday, after his visit to you, that Senator George's view was not your view. Is there, in fact, any great difference?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, as a matter of fact, I don't think there is any great difference between anybody's view here. This is what I really believe: everybody, in talking about an item such as this, gets a particular detail which he emphasizes in his own mind to a very great degree, and suddenly a quarrel springs out of it. I think all of the gentlemen to whom you refer are sincerely seeking peace; some believe one thing, some another. Now, the Secretary of State, under my direction, is responsible for carrying these things forward. I think that his attitude toward it is eminently correct and proper and conciliatory. We are trying to seek a peace with honor, and we are simply trying to avoid that kind of useless bickering and the using of international conferences merely for propaganda purposes, disappointing people. That is the futile kind of thing we are trying to avoid, and that is all. Otherwise we are all for seeing, can we advance the cause of peace?

Q. Joseph C. Harsch, Christian Science Monitor: Sir, I wonder if you can clarify something I am not quite clear on. In your last press conference, referring to the use of atomic weapons, you said that when it was a question of strictly military targets for strictly military purposes, you saw no reason why they shouldn't be used just exactly as you would use a bullet or anything else. On January 12, we were talking about atomic weapons in connection with police action as distinct from a major war, and within that context you said you did not think that normally we would use the atomic weapons, because, you thought, you could not conceive of atomic weapons as a police weapon, and there was some further remark there that it was so destructive.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, Mr. Harsch, the difference here, I think, is perfectly simple. A police action is not war; a police action is restoring order. Now, you don't send in bombs to restore order when a riot occurs. You get police people to restore order. Occasionally there may be a life lost if someone is too tough about it.But when you get into actual war, you have resorted to force for reaching a decision in a particular area; that is what I call War. And whether the war is big or not, if you have the kind of a weapon that can be limited to military use, then I know of no reason why a large explosion shouldn't be used as freely as a small explosion. That is all I was saying last week. But that is different from trying to restore order. Incidentally, if you want to follow some of these things off into the realm of great philosophical conjecture, suppose you won a war by the indiscriminate use of atomic weapons; what would you have left? Now, what would you do for your police action, for your occupation and restoration of order, and all of the things needed to be done in a great area of the earth?I repeat, the concept of atomic war is too horrible for man to endure and to practice, and he must find some way out of it. That is all I think about this thing.

Q. Mr. Harsch: Sir, I am a little stupid about this thing.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I am glad you didn't say I was! [Laughter]

Q. Mr. Harsch: It would seem to me there is big war at one end, just a local police action in which one person might be killed at the other; and, in between, what the military people would say was limited war. The Korean War, in a sense, was a limited war.

THE PRESIDENT. It became one, anyway. Q. Mr. Harsch: It became one. If we got into an

issue with the Chinese, say, over Matsu and Quemoy, that we wanted to keep limited, do you conceive of using this specific kind of atomic weapon in that situation or not?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, Mr. Harsch, I must confess I cannot answer that question in advance. The only thing I know about war are two things: the most changeable factor in war is human nature in its day-by-day manifestation; but the only unchanging factor in war is human nature. And the next thing is that every war is going to astonish you in the way it occurred, and in the way it is carried out. So that for a man to predict, particularly if he has the responsibility for making the decision, to predict what he is going to use, how he is going to do it, would I think exhibit his ignorance of war; that is what I believe. So I think you just have to wait, and that is the kind of prayerful decision that may some day face a President. We are trying to establish conditions where he doesn't.

Q. Raymond P. Brandt, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: Mr. President, have you any plan to take an active part in saving your foreign trade program in Congress?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I can't go to the floor and debate, Mr. Brandt. After all, we all know that, but this is what I think: the foreign trade program, as a notice to all peoples that we recognize their problems, that we are earnestly trying to establish the kind of economic base on which cultural values and spiritual values can be properly developed and bring about a greater union among us, that kind of a program is so essential to the United States today that I would use every bit of influence that I can properly and appropriately bring to bear to have it passed. I think this is a very critical item now before the United States of America, not merely before Government, but before the whole country.

Q. Walter T. Ridder, Ridder Papers: Mr. President, do you believe that the release of the Yalta documents might cramp styles in future conferences?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I would hope not. Among allies, gentlemen, I want to call your attention to this one fact: you make treaties, and good faith is involved. Now, the one place, if you will read history, is that treaties have always fallen down when it came to actual war, if any one country felt that its vital considerations were going to be damaged through the purposes of its allies. You can go back through the history of coalitions, and you will find great evidence of this. As a matter of fact, one soldier said that he always considered Napoleon the greatest soldier that ever lived, until he woke up one day and found that he always fought against coalitions. And then he lost some of his respect. Now, this is one way of defining the difficulties of coalitions. Good faith is involved; so that while I earnestly believe that all documents should be published, not attempting to pin or assess blame for success and failure, I believe when the good faith with an ally is involved we want to be exceedingly careful. Moreover, I think such documents should be confined, in general, to those things that are of political and military significance. Casual conversation, I think, should not be included. I would hope that our country would never be legitimately charged with bad faith, and in this particular case I think it wasn't. They had been, I believe, in communication with our ally for a long time about it. However, there was some difference of opinion. Now, in this matter, let me repeat, there is nothing, as I can see, to be gained by going back 10 years and showing that, in the light of afterevents, that someone may have been wrong, or someone may have been right. People that are so sure that we could do this, forget one thing: you can never recapture the atmosphere of war. You have the great advantage of events. I think I have often told you that one of the most severe decisions I had to make in the

war was to direct the capture of Pantelleria. Yet that was so easy that most of you don't even know where Pantelleria was. And in the afterevent, it made not a ripple in history. Yet the decision was so difficult that had the predictions of the pessimists been realized, I certainly would have been relieved. So that you can never tell, at the moment, is history going to say this was right or this was wrong. If we believe these people acted for what they thought was the best good, of the cause for which they were fighting, of their country, well, then, let us take and lay the thing out dispassionately so that we, in our turn, may profit from their mistakes. But don't let's try to just damage reputations by such means.

Q. Ingrid M. Jewell, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette: Mr. President, Senator Bricker thinks that his proposed amendment.

THE PRESIDENT. I couldn't quite hear you.

Q. Miss Jewell: Senator Bricker believes that his proposed amendment has a good chance of going through this year because he thinks you have changed your mind about it since last year. Have you changed your mind?

THE PRESIDENT. No.

Q. Clark R. Mollenhoff, Des Moines Register: You suffered one of your sharpest defeats in the House on this postal pay bill. I wonder if you would give us some of your own personal views as to why you oppose the 10 percent in favor of the 5 percent?

THE PRESIDENT. Since 1945 the postal clerks and carriers have gone from something of an order of a $1700 wage to a $3200, something of a 92-percent raise. The top scales, I think, of those same grades have gone up about 94 percent. I give you that statistic just to show that these people have not been neglected. Moreover, when you begin to talk about pay scales you have got to take in not merely the percentage that one group now may receive as opposed to another group; you have got to go back into the whole background and history of the thing. Exactly the same way in the opposite sense with some of the military. Some of the military grades have been neglected, and we need to raise them or we are not going to have proper people there. I sent to the Congress a plan, for both civil service people and postal people, that had been studied long and earnestly in a great effort to do the right thing by the individuals themselves, to do it sensibly and in accordance with efficient governmental management of the great processes we have to carry out. Now, I believe still that that is a correct program for the readjustments and revisions of classification and the scale of increase that it proposes; and any great increase over that would cause me, as I said in a letter, the gravest concern.

Q. Sarah McClendon, El Paso Times: Mr. President, I believe Vice President Nixon has spoken to you about the merit of completing the Inter-American Highway, and he said at the present rate it won't be completed until 15 or 25 years have passed. Have you and he--have you agreed on a plan for speeding up the financing of this, so it may be completed?

THE PRESIDENT. No. In his report to the Cabinet he mentioned this, and gave his conclusions as of tremendous importance. Now, the next thing that will happen will be that State and Commerce will unquestionably make a recommendation to me as to what we should do in the way of getting the necessary appropriations. I believe they are relatively small. But I will say this: instinctively, I am on his side. I believe that this road should be completed.

Q. Marvin L. Arrowsmith, Associated Press: Mr. President, is any effort being made by either this Government directly or through the British to negotiate a cease-fire in the Formosa Strait, I mean any new efforts as an attempt through the U.N.?

THE PRESIDENT. As of this moment?

Q. Mr. Arrowsmith: Yes.

THE PRESIDENT. No, there is no particular or specific program now in progress, but I should say this: that, of course, the British, with representation in Peking, have always represented our viewpoint, which is that any just, reasonable solution of the difficulty in the Formosa Straits would receive our most earnest and sympathetic attention. We ourselves supported putting it before the United Nations, but there is no specific plan at the moment.

Q. William H. Lawrence, New York Times: Mr. President, in your concluding remarks about the Yalta papers a moment ago, you said if we believe these people acted for the best good; is it correct to interpret that to say that you believe they acted for the best good as they saw it?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I meant my remark, Mr. Lawrence, in this way: so far as I know, I have never in public questioned a man's motives, even if I thought he was mistaken; I have criticized military leaders in staff schools in my time very severely. I certainly would not question his motives. I question the motives of no man when I wasn't there and know nothing about what he was doing.

Q. Mr. Lawrence: May I ask one supplementary question?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Q. Mr. Lawrence: You were a responsible field commander at the time and informed of general strategy. Did you record or do you remember a decision that you reached at that time at your own level as to the rightness or wrongness of Yalta?

THE PRESIDENT. No. The only faint connection I had was this: the British and American contingents met in Malta before going on to Yalta. I didn't have time to go down. I was engaged in a very heavy battle, and I sent my Chief of Staff down to represent what our operational plans for the spring were, and to tell them. They were all approved. As a matter of fact, it was sent down for information. But I did tell two or three of the individuals involved that the Western allied forces were going to get at least as far as the Elbe in this operation--our calculations were that we had now used up all the disposable reserves the Germans had to put on the western front, and that we were going to penetrate deep into Germany--and I would hope, therefore, that these people would have that knowledge before they made any agreement. However, don't forget this: all during that year of 1944 the European Advisory Commission had been meeting in London, and these plans were worked out by the Advisory Commission. As far as I know, Yalta had only the job of approving them, because all these countries had been represented on that Commission. I believe John Winant was our representative. I merely said that we were going to go further east into Germany than the line they described to me, and that is the only thing I knew about. I never was at Yalta; I didn't even go to Malta.

Q. Edward T. Folliard, Washington Post and Times Herald: Mr. President, to go back to the high

level conference, Senator George's position, as I understand it, is this: that he would not require the Russians to meet any particular conditions; that is, he would not require that they show their earnestness with deeds rather than with words. Now, I do not understand that to be your position, Mr. President. I am trying to find out whether there is a real difference.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, there may be. I don't deny that every individual that approaches these problems has his own detailed solution for them. I merely want to say that I am seeking an honorable peace and trying to create confidence among the peoples of the free world, not just bouncing around to do nothing. Now, there is this one thing, the argument on the other side: there have been at least two changes within the last couple of years in the personnel of the ruling group in the Kremlin. Consequently, you have at least the element of, let us say, faint hope that new individuals may be different from the old ones; that may make some exploratory talks very valuable. And as long as we are differentiating between a final big so-called meeting at the summit and exploratory talks--well, exploratory talks, I could make a lot of concessions to have that carried out.

Q. Robert G. Spivack, New York Post: Mr. President, if we may return to the Far East for a moment: one of the solutions that has been suggested for ending the Far East crisis has been a U.N. trusteeship for Formosa. I wonder if this Government is receptive to that idea?

THE PRESIDENT. I believe I won't talk about that one this morning. I dislike ever saying "No comment" to you people, but that is one that I have not talked in detail because, for my own part, I had not up to this moment taken it as an acceptable solution to people we are trying to keep on our side.

Q. Frederick Kuh, Chicago Sun-Times: Mr. President, in your consideration of a Four Power conference, is it your premise that the Russians will be willing to participate in such a conference within a matter of some months after ratification of the Paris agreements?

THE PRESIDENT. I don't know. That is one of the subjects we discuss constantly: what would be their attitude toward an invitation? And maybe it would be even worth while finally to find out what that is. But I don't know, and I don't think anyone else could really make a good guess.

Q. Nat S. Finney, Buffalo News: Mr. President, did you intend to assign a lower order of priority to the deeds of an Austrian treaty and German elections, and North Korea? Does what you said give them a lower order of priority of importance than they have had heretofore?

THE PRESIDENT. I couldn't imagine what would make you ask such a question. Nothing I have ever said would indicate that. No. I am merely giving these indications of something that would mean to me, "Look, these people are talking business." They have violated their word so often, they have left us hanging on the limb. As a matter of fact, our great interest in all of these past agreements and papers is why did we trust them so much. All I want to know is what can I depend on to mean to me this: we are approaching this seriously and earnestly; that is all.

Q. John L. Cutter, United Press: Mr. President, a member of your liaison staff has been up to the Congress to see a member of the Michigan delegation regarding the establishment of a jet air base near Cadillac, Michigan. Does that mean that the White House has any particular interest in that one particular place?

THE PRESIDENT. [This is the first time I have heard of it; and if anyone has an interest in it, it certainly must be personal. I know nothing about it.]

Merriman Smith, United Press: Thank you, Mr. President.

(62) President's Press Conference March 30, 1955 [President Eisenhower's sixty-fifth news conference was held in the Executive Office Building from 10:34 to 11:03am, in attendance: 217.]

EL-Dl6-65 (PC)

[This is a complete transcript of the news conference of this date. Those portions of the President's replies which were not released for broadcasting or direct quotation at that time are enclosed in brackets.]

THE PRESIDENT. My first announcement this morning is to express--and, I think, on behalf of all of you--a deep regret at the death of Harold Beckley, Superintendent of the Senate Press Gallery, who has been on this door ever since I have been holding press conferences in this room. I think all of us would like to join in expressing our regret to those that were close to him. I want to mention briefly these bipartisan lunches I am having today and tomorrow, merely to assure you that there is no specific or special purpose behind them. We started talking about them two or three weeks ago. It was some little trouble to find two days in succession that were blank on my luncheon calendar and convenient to the people on the Hill. We have at least arranged it, and we expect to talk over the world situation in general. There is no agenda, no specific subject to be discussed. As you know, the French and Italian Parliaments have both ratified the Paris agreements, and I couldn't possibly exaggerate in expressing my satisfaction. I speak as one who was sent over there some years ago to work on this proposition. I was very strong for EDC. When EDC was rejected, I though this was the next best we could do. I am delighted that the Parliaments have gone this far with the unification of our security arrangements in that area. Now, that's all the announcements I have. We will go to questions.

Q. Merriman Smith, United Press: Mr. President, within the past week Admiral Carney has been quoted as saying that there might be a Red Chinese attack on Matsu, followed in a month or about a month, by an attack on Quemoy. We understand that you feel otherwise and, furthermore, don't like the expression of this sort of estimate on Admiral Carney's part. I wonder if you could discuss that situation for us.

THE PRESIDENT. Ladies and gentlemen, I have tried to say it many times: none of us possesses a crystal ball. We cannot pretend to the accuracy of the ancient prophets when we talk about the future. I have heard the possibility of war discussed many times during my governmental career, and I have seen it occur on two or three occasions. But to prophesy when a war is going to break out is to assume that we have an accuracy of information that, I think, has never yet been attained by a country that was to be attacked. What I have tried to say is this: in this poor and distressed world, the danger, the risk of war is always with us, and we have got to be vigilant. We have got to be careful. And while we are doing it we have got to be as fair and as large-minded as we know how, to accommodate and to understand the fears and the ambitions of others that might lead them into a risky venture and such a tragic thing as this; at the same time so conducting ourselves that the world knows we are strong, strong in our principles, in our faith, also strong

militarily and economically. I don't believe there is any possible way as of this time of describing the situation any better. If I can make a comment, it is this: I do not believe that the peace of the world, the tranquillity of the world, is being served at this moment by talking too much in terms of speculation about such things. I think that is all I have to say about it.

Q. Joseph C. Harsch, Christian Science Monitor: Mr. President, a military question: would you tell us whether, in your opinion, the United States can successfully defend Formosa, even if we should give up or refrain from doing anything about the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu?

THE PRESIDENT. I think that the attitude and the calculations of this Government were pretty well laid out before the Senate and the House at the time of the passage of the recent resolution asking for authority to act under given situations. However, I would say this: a terrific burden would depend upon the forces and the people occupying Formosa as to the possibility of its defense. You have to have forces there who are of high morale, who have something in which to believe if they are going to fight well, as that is the only way men fight. They don't fight just to get out and shoot at each other, so they must believe in something. And we must be careful not to destroy their morale. That is a factor that you must always calculate when you talk about surrendering this place or that place or doing anything else. Now, as I say again, even for me, I don't think there is much to be gained by speculation in this field. But I do want you to see this one factor that is terrifically important if you are going to make a successful military defense of any area.

Q. Ray Scherer, National Broadcasting Company: Mr. President, could you assess the present possibility for a cease-fire in the Formosa Straits?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I can't. And if you will pardon me, I think we have talked enough about Formosa. I don't believe I have anything more to say about it.

Q. Clark R. Mollenhoff, Des Moines Register: Mr. President, Representative Price of Illinois has said that Allen Whitfield, who you nominated for the Atomic Energy Commission, is a professional politician, and he criticized the administration for what he said "making the Atomic Energy Commission the dumping ground for job-hungry Republicans." I wonder if you could tell us if you intend to withdraw the nomination, as he demanded; how you happened to select Whitfield, and what particular qualifications you thought he brought to the job.

THE PRESIDENT. [That is like defending yourself against "beating your wife." [Laughter] [I have tried to tell you people, and I assure you I have tried to follow this theory in the appointment of people: I have appointed those people that are close to me and on whom I must depend for advice and counsel in many things, including the selection of subordinates. I have depended on their advice and counsel in the selection of the people they need. These people close to me I trust. Then, once they are selected, they have to pass certain tests. There are certain field tests, and all kinds of things that they go through. If they are found to measure up they are appointed. In the case of Mr. Whitfield, I think that there is probably no worse being said against him than being said against lots of people. But I know of no one that we have appointed whose standing in his community, whose reputation, whose readiness to serve his government, are not of a very high order.]

Q. Raymond P. Brandt, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: Mr. President, Secretary Dulles has said that it

will take months to prepare for a Big Four conference. We have had the conditions laid down for the Russians coming in. Could you tell us some of the subjects that could be discussed at a Big Four conference?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, Mr. Brandt, it is not an easy question, because there are so many different kinds of meetings that have been proposed by different people. One proposal, coming from a very eminent source, has been that we merely meet without an agenda, and we have a broad talk. Well, now, there are many dangers in such a meeting because it could be considered, let us say, social. If it is a social sort of get-together, trying to be friendly, there are many people in the world that are interpreting actions as well as words, and they are interpreting them in terms of what has happened to them and what does this meeting mean to them? That is one kind of a meeting that you have to watch. Moreover, if you would have a meeting, certain questions would almost have to be examined; for example, let us say, the unification of Germany or some question affecting Germany. The wheels are now moving to make Germany, West Germany, a completely independent country. How can you talk about Germany unless Germany is present? But if you ask Germany, where do you stop? There are all sorts of things to be decided in these preparations before you can just meet and have something that is promising for the peace of the world. I would certainly hesitate to be a party to a meeting where people would have a right, merely because you meet, to expect more than you really believe you can deliver. Now I reiterate, the United States Government is ready to do anything. We will meet on any basis as long as we are not, in so doing, creating an impression we think is damaging.

Q. Mr. Brandt: Isn't it true, sir, that the lower level conference would work out an agenda?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I don't know whether they would even have to work out an entire agenda, Mr. Brandt. I quoted to you the other day the example in the Rose Palace in Paris in 1952 when, after meeting for 3 months to decide upon an agenda for another meeting, they abandoned the effort; they could not do it. But they would have to make a sufficient preparation for this thing so we could try to determine, at least, or we could have some confidence of what we are getting into. It is a very serious question.

Q. Richard L. Wilson, Cowles Publications: Mr. President--

THE PRESIDENT. Could I interrupt just a minute?

Q. Mr. Wilson: Yes, certainly.

THE PRESIDENT. I was asked by a listener whether each person--no, stand up--whether each person asking a question would speak loudly and get as close to a microphone as he could. I forgot it this morning. [Laughter]

Q. Mr. Wilson: They will have to raise this for me, sir.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, they always do that on the stage, you know. [Laughter]

Q. Mr. Wilson: Perhaps that will put you in a good humor for this question. [Laughter] It may fall within your earlier remark that you did not want to discuss Formosa. However, it has been stated in the newspapers and on the radio that your position is one thing or another with respect to Quemoy and Matsu; but I have not heard, sir, you express your opinion as to these recent

discussions or whether or not the recent accounts in the press are true. So I would ask you--

THE PRESIDENT. The recent accounts are true?

Q. Mr. Wilson: Yes, sir. Do you disagree with the proposition that there may be an attack on Matsu from April 15th onward?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, certainly, I will go back to that subject long enough to say this: I cannot say that there will not, because I don't know. But I do say that if anyone is predicting it will be that soon, and can give me logical reasons for believing it will be that soon, they have information that I do not have.

Q. Charles E. Shutt, Telenews: There has been a great deal of talk lately, alleged in many quarters to be very partisan; and yesterday on Capitol Hill, Senator Smathers and Senator Carlson said perhaps we were getting into an election year a year earlier and, perhaps, a moratorium should be declared on mudslinging. Would you comment on that, sir, the partisan talk that has been going on recently?

THE PRESIDENT. In some things I think a man's conscience has got to determine his own actions, but it has apparently very little to do with the actions of others. If I have been guilty of mudslinging anywhere, I would be glad to account for it and to apologize to my unintended victim. I don't believe in mudslinging. I don't believe it does any good. As a matter of fact, I think it would be a good moment to just say how much I have respected and admired the attitude that Senator George has taken, for example, in trying to preserve a true bipartisan, unpartisan approach to all our foreign problems. [I wouldn't even talk, therefore, about a party that contained such a man who is working as hard as he is to make the foreign affairs of the United States go forward successfully.]

Q. Sarah McClendon, El Paso Times: Sir, I seem to recall in World War II that military personnel were warned not to talk. And isn't it very poor military strategy, to say the least, for us to go out here talking about our enemies' war plans?

THE PRESIDENT. As a matter of fact, you have something there. I meant to express something of that kind when I said I didn't believe that we were doing the United States much good by speculating too much into the future on this thing. There are just certain things in the world--if you are going to live in the confidence that you are right, ready to protect your rights, but you are not going to resort to aggressive force yourself, then you have got to be patient and strong in your patience, not to let anybody run over you, but not to try to say, "They are going to attack me today; therefore, I attacked them yesterday so that I don't get in bad trouble."

Q. Marvin Arrowsmith, Associated Press: Mr. President, not meaning to transgress on your enough-about-Formosa remark, but will Admiral Carney be reprimanded for his remarks of last week?

THE PRESIDENT. Not by me.

Q. Alan S. Emory, Watertown Times: Mr. President, Congressman Walter of Pennsylvania has attacked Mr. Edward Corsi, the new Special Assistant to the Secretary of State on Refugee and Migration Problems, as allegedly having been a member of several Communist-front

organizations. I wondered if you would comment, sir, on your personal acquaintance with Mr. Corsi and whether you think any individual who had been active in a Communist-front organization would have a chance of getting that high a job in the State Department?

THE PRESIDENT. [Well, you have got a lot of "ifs" in there in that question. Now, actually, I have met Mr. Corsi. I have talked to him. My appointment of him again was on the recommendations of people I trust. He was put in that position actually, of course, by the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State has reported to me that he has been very valuable in the position. I know nothing about these accusations against him, but I am sure that it could be looked up if you go to the Secretary of State.]

Q. Chalmers M. Roberts, Washington Post and Times Herald: A couple of weeks ago you appointed Harold Stassen as a Special Assistant for Disarmament. I wonder if you could give us a little of your thinking behind the creation of that job, and just what the scope of it is.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, the concept is very simple. Here is something that is a terrific problem in the world. We all know what burdens are created by the maintenance of these sterile, unproductive agencies we call defense units and organizations. We are putting billions and billions into them. We would like to reduce them.Now, each department of Government, as far as I can see, almost each individual in such a country as ours, has some particular idea of what he thinks might work. On some sides they want purely, let's say, a theoretical approach. On other sides they will go to the extremes of quid pro quo: "Don't do a thing, just build more bombs." What is our thinking? There was nobody in the Government, up until I appointed Governor Stassen to this post, that was responsible for getting together all of the different ideas affecting disarmament and putting them together so the administration can say, "This is our program, and this is what we are trying to do in this field." State approaches this from one way, Defense approaches it from another, your economic people approach it from still another. You have all sorts of viewpoints; and some think this will work, that will work. Let us have somebody with a small staff who cannot only do something to bring together, draw together, these views, but to devise a short, easily expressed program, maybe that all of us here could adopt and say, "Yes, that is good." Now, that is what he is for.

Q. Mr. Roberts: Could I ask, sir, is it your thinking that disarmament is an instrument on the way to what you have called the modus vivendi or that you get disarmament agreement after you have created an atmosphere in which--

THE PRESIDENT. Personally, I believe these things have got to go hand in hand. Fear begets fear. Now, you have armaments. If you are going to say, "Let us be more peaceful, let's make a more peaceful arrangement somewhere, and then we can reduce armaments," they will say, "Well don't you think we had better do this at the same time?" Then as we make this nice arrangement, there won't be quite so much capacity for one nation to attack another. I think you have now given a perfect example of the kind of thing that we should like to have some brains giving exclusive attention to: what is a good explanation of the sequential steps that must take place if this is going to have any chance of success?

Q. Laurence H. Burd, Chicago Tribune: Mr. President, has this Government received any recent report from the United Nations on its effort to release the flyers held by Red China, and if not, are we going to ask for one, or take any other steps?

THE PRESIDENT. Only the report, Mr. Burd, that they are still working actively in this field. That is the report.

Q. Robert G. Spivack, New York Post: Mr. President, before, you mentioned some of the obstacles that are in the way, or the difficulties that are in the way of a Big Four conference; I wonder about one that you didn't mention. Do we know yet whether things have shaken down in Russia and who the top man in the Russian Government is now?

THE PRESIDENT. NO, I think we know nothing more than what is apparent on the face of things. That is, if you take the organization at face value, why then, you would say Marshal Bulganin is the head. But I think it would be a bold man to say that they knew he was the true principal influence in the government today.

Q. Francis M. Stephenson, New York Daily News: With all respect, Mr. President, I would like to ask you by whose authority your aides are giving out such information as whether or not we are going to war to ten or twenty men who invite them out to dinner? Don't you think the New York Daily News is entitled to that news?

THE PRESIDENT. [Well, I am not, of course, responsible for the friends that my subordinates have, nor can I be responsible for exactly what they say. Now, I am sure someone expressed a personal opinion. Whether or not they have a right to do so, possibly you can say they have to talk to everybody if they talk to one. But, so far as I know, the individual concerned had no idea of the questions that were going to be asked him. I want to make clear he does have a right to his personal convictions. But he cannot utter them properly, in my opinion, if he is going to create difficulty for his administration, for his commander in chief, or in violation of any announced policy of an administration, because then he doesn't belong as a member of the team.]

Q. Mr. Stephenson: Well, it has reached a point, Mr. President, where we have to invite your aides to dinner before we can get such very important information, whether we are going to war.

THE PRESIDENT. [My dear sir, why do you suppose I come over here every week? I am not asking you to see anybody else. I come over here every week to subject myself to your questions for a half hour. Now you can ask any question of substance, but don't ask me to criticize somebody else when I don't even know the circumstances of the meeting.]

Q. William M. Blair, New York Times: Mr. President, the bipartisan farm bloc in Congress is making an effort to change the administration's farm program and restore high rigid price supports. Their concern is that the farm economy is going down and endangering the rest of the economy. Do you share this view, sir, and do you intend to back Mr. Benson in his program?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I want to make this remark: every--it is true that farm prices have fallen, and it is a development that has caused the gravest concern over a number of years. I think they fell some 19 points in the 2 years just prior to '53, and some 8 or 9 since then.But I must point this out: every bit of that drop has been under the 90 percent rigid price supports. The flexible price support program has not yet been effective, and it will not become effective until the '55 crops are ready for marketing. So that to say that the flexible price supports or to hint or to imply that they are responsible for this drop is just, in my opinion, not correct. Of course we are giving attention to it. We are looking at every possible thing there is to do in this field. But the purpose of flexible price supports is to discourage production in those items in which we are

constantly building up surpluses, to transfer our agriculture a bit, so that we can really get supply and demand in better balance.

Q. Robert E. Clark, International News Service: Mr. President, this is a question that applies to the long-range defense of Formosa rather than the current crisis. Brigadier General Frank Howley recently toured Formosa and the Far East, and has made several proposals for strengthening our position in dealing with the Chinese Communists. One of these is that we arm the Chinese Nationalist Army with atomic weapons. Another is that we make it clear to Red China that one more aggressive step on their part will mean their complete destruction by our atomic power. Can you give us your opinion on this?

THE PRESIDENT. You say he recommended that?

Q. Mr. Clark: That is right.

THE PRESIDENT. [I haven't heard it, Mr. Clark, and I have not seen the two points or at least the first point discussed in detail. I do not believe that, as I say, the cause of peace is now to be served by making any further commitments about the area at all, I mean commitments in terms of intention.]

Q. Merriman Smith, United Press: Mr. President, what do you think of the position taken by the man you nominated as Comptroller General in opposition to your highway program? He has told Congress that he thinks the financing system is unsound and, possibly, illegal. I refer to Mr. Campbell.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, Mr. Smith, I nominated to the position of Comptroller General the man I thought was best qualified in the United States. Mr. Campbell was my associate and assistant when I was at Columbia University. He was the treasurer of a very large organization. He is a splendid accountant, and he is certainly an honest gentleman. Now, the last thing I would ever ask any man that I appoint to high office is what are going to be his decisions in specific cases. If any man would pledge to me that he was going to make a certain decision because I asked him, he would never be appointed. So I have to concede to him his right to follow his own judgment and convictions. But I do tell you this, I think he is wrong. [Laughter]

Q. Lawrence Fernsworth, Concord (New Hampshire) Monitor: I don't wish to break the moratorium, Mr. President. I am merely asking for clarification. There has been some speculation since your statement that a year hence you would answer the question concerning your candidacy; there has been some speculation that you are awaiting the primaries in New Hampshire, in the first week of--the second Tuesday of March. Would you comment on that, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. You know, some of these questions, I am going to refer them to this body and see whether they actually do break the moratorium. [Laughter] I haven't even thought about the primaries in New Hampshire. And you are informing me now of something that I do recall--that they do come in March. [Laughter]

Q. Charles E. Egan, New York Times: Could you tell us when or if that committee you named to study transportation has reported to you yet, the committee headed by Secretary Weeks?

THE PRESIDENT. [I will have to explain my answer to this extent: we have had preliminary

discussions on it. Whether the final report came to me I can't say at this moment.] Mr. Hagerty: Not yet.

THE PRESIDENT. [Not yet. We have had preliminary discussions and, therefore, I couldn't be certain.]

Q. Elie Abel, New York Times: Could you give us your thought, sir, on what arrangements you would like to see made for the future of the Foreign Operations Administration which, I believe, expires June 30?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think that theoretically we had a good organization. But there are a number of considerations that apply. I believe that in some ways it is best to get the end item defense portions of those expenditures really included in the Defense budget as separate items--I don't mean to say thereby to reduce the necessary expenditures for our own defense--and then to take over in a separate bureau, possibly in the State department, something like the Internal Revenue is organized in the Treasury Department. I would visualize something like that. I want to make clear, if the answer is something different, don't accuse me of bad faith. I am giving you my personal idea of how it could be done well.

Q. Daniel Schorr, CBS News: I understand, sir, we were remiss in journalistic enterprise last week. Mr. President, how about the squirrels? [Laughter]

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I'll tell you: I think first you ought to interview the squirrels and find out if anybody is unhappy. [Laughter] I don't see any reason for producing another pressure group until we find out they are really unhappy, with a freedom I would personally dearly love. [Laughter]

Merriman Smith, United Press: Thank you, Mr. President.

(65) Statement by the President on the Retirement of Sir Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom April 5, 1955 [The President made this impromptu statement to newsmen in the Rose Garden.]

EL-Dl6-31 (IR)

WE HAVE just had official word that my old and very dear friend, Sir Winston Churchill, has retired from his position as head of Her Majesty's government in the United Kingdom. Naturally, an event such as this recalls to my mind many stirring incidents both of war and peace. I have greatly respected and valued my associations with a man so great as Winston Churchill. And now, if I dare, I should like to address a word directly to Sir Winston. All of us in the free world can respect your decision, Sir Winston, to retire from official office, to live now a somewhat more serene life than has been possible in a position of such great responsibility as yours. But we shall never accept the thought that we are to be denied your counsel, your advice. Out of your great experience, your great wisdom, and your great courage, the free world yet has much to gain, and we know that you will never be backward in bringing those qualities forward when we appeal to you for help, as all of us are bound to do. Good luck to you in retirement. To you and your family all the happiness that it is possible for you to have. Now for the rest of us, I hope that I have spoken the words you would like to speak, no matter how haltingly or how roughly. Thank you.

(68) Remarks to the Easter Egg Rollers on the South Grounds of the White House April 11, 1955

EL-Dl6-31 (IR)

GOOD MORNING, folks. I didn't come out here to make you a talk. I came out to welcome you to the White House grounds, to congratulate you on the weather you are having for the egg-rolling, and to hope that every youngster here has a wonderful time, and nobody gets lost. Last year there were quite a number lost, but we found out it wasn't the children that were lost at all; it was just the parents. This time I hope that everything will work out so that you can all stay together and have a wonderful time. Mrs. Eisenhower is sorry she couldn't be here to say "Welcome," but I assure you that she feels that way. So have a good time, and I hope it doesn't rain today. Goodbye. Thank you very much.

(70) Remarks at the Citadel, Charleston, South Carolina April 12, 1955 [The President spoke on the Parade Grounds, immediately after receiving an honorary degree of Doctor of Laws. His opening words "General Clark" referred to General Mark W. Clark, President of The Citadel.]

EL-Dl6-31(IR)

General Clark, Members of this distinguished audience, and members of the Corps of Cadets of The Citadel:

I would need scarcely search for words in order to express to you something of the great feeling of honor I have in the receipt of this honor through such a distinguished institution and at the hands of one of my oldest friends in the military services. I am sure that you must feel yourselves how moved I am by the circumstances of this meeting. Quite naturally, with my background, a ceremony such as this carries me back forty and more years. I see myself marching. Incidentally, I see myself again resenting the presence of VIP's that interrupted some vacation or period of my own and who had me out in full dress, marching for the edification of an audience and of that particular VIP.

There was one redeeming feature, occasionally, about such occasions. Sometimes this VIP had the wit and the knowledge to suggest to the Commander that it might be sort of recompense to the Corps if punishments were remitted. But of course that was in the years gone by, and I am not certain what the custom is now. And of course, I am not really familiar any longer with the rank of the individual that has the right to ask such a great favor. But, moreover, since I am now, by vicarious graduation, a sort of member of this body, whether or not he might consider it effrontery on my part to ask, I wouldn't know.

But passing those things, if I could attempt to leave with you young men a message this morning, it would be one truly of congratulation. I am informed that 95 percent of this graduating class is going into some element of the military services, either Reserves or Active. I suppose that that sort of percentage applies throughout the years. Certainly I have met many of your alumni throughout the years that I served with in the Army.

Now, what I want to speak to you for just a minute is of both the opportunities of men who are going into the Armed Services, Active and Inactive, and something about the scope of the

responsibilities and problems that you will meet.

First of all, the opportunities. You are given that most priceless of opportunities: to work directly and specifically for the welfare of the United States of America, and there is no greater honor that is achievable by any American.

And secondly, what I want to say to you is the scope of the understanding you must achieve if you are now to do the task far transcends what your illustrious Commandant or Superintendent and I understood when we were waiting on the plain at West Point forty or more years ago receiving our diplomas and entered into the regular service.

Today, a man to do his duty in the military services must study humanity first of all--what makes humans tick. Not only as regards to your own companies, to be for them the leader and the model, but since you must be one of the principal apostles of peace, you must try to understand other people. You must try to understand the heart of America and how to translate that heart to other peoples. You must know something of economics, and of course your profession will make you know something of law and engineering and many of the sciences; but above all, we come back to it: you must try to understand people.

How else, I ask you, are we to achieve peace in this world, unless there be a magnificent growth of understanding? Mere knowledge is not enough. The highest star man in this Corps of Cadets, unless he strives for understanding and achieves understanding, by which to interpret and to relate among themselves all the facts that he may have learned in science and social science and the humanities, cannot be a leader.

And I know that in this institution just as in all others, we have our devoted educators trying to get over to all of their students that thought: let us strive to understand--understand each other, and our Nation to understand others, and help them to an understanding of ourselves.I do not mean to say for an instant that all of these opportunities, all of these responsibilities--all of these things--are exclusive to the soldier, to the sailor, to the air man, to the Marine. Of course not. But since the man in the services holds up his right hand and swears to uphold the Constitution of the United States and to serve her to the depths of his ability, through life unto death, it comes home, possibly, to him a little more sharply than it does to others.

Now already, my friends, I have violated my promise that I was not going to keep you here long, but if I could just leave with you this thought: America is bound to watch you. They know you are a graduate of The Citadel. You know they know you have the early phases of your preparation for the highest form of citizenship. They are going to watch you. They will expect much of you. And for my part, now that I know I am one of your alumni, I know you are going to succeed--each of you.

Thanks again for the great compliment of your review, and I think it would be not out of place to say that my eye since early youth has been accustomed to the sight of good soldiers-neat, soldierly-appearing people that show the evidences of training. I have seen no body that excels this one, and I congratulate you and all that are responsible for it. I congratulate the great State that supports you.

Good luck to you, and thanks again for this great honor.

(78) Remarks Regarding the Citation Presented to the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis April 22, 1955

[Citation read by the President. Remarks by the President following the presentation of the citation to Basil O'Connor, President of the Foundation. The President spoke in the Rose Garden. Mr. O'Connor was introduced by Secretary Hobby.]

EL-Dl6-52 (RA)

I, DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, President of the United States, present this special citation to the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis for its unswerving devotion to the eradication of poliomyelitis.

The American people recognize a debt of gratitude to the Foundation and to its founder, the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, whose personal courage in overcoming the handicap of poliomyelitis stands as a symbol of the fight against this disease.

Without the support and encouragement of the Foundation, the work of Dr. Jonas E. Salk and of many others who contributed to the development of a preventive vaccine could not have gone forward so rapidly. The Foundation displayed remarkable faith in sponsoring and determination in fostering their valiant effort for the health of all mankind.

The generous voluntary support of the Foundation by the American people has been dramatically justified. In their name, I am privileged to make this award to the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis.

[Remarks of the President following the presentation of the citation to Basil O'Connor, President of the Foundation]

And there, of course, remains the great problem of rapid production, distribution on the fairest possible basis, and to that) problem as Secretary Hobby has said, you and many others are working and contributing to carry the thing forward until there is no more poliomyelitis remaining in the United States. And I thank you and all of the Foundation of which you are President.

(79) Address at the Annual Luncheon of the Associated Press, New York City April 25, 1955

[The President spoke at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, at 2pm. His opening words referred to Robert McLean, publisher of the Philadelphia Evening and Sunday Bulletin and President of the Associated Press, and Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.]

EL-Dl6-53 (RA)

Mr. McLean, Mrs. Secretary Hobby, and ladies and gentlemen:

Always, I feel it is a special privilege when I can meet with men and women of the newspaper profession. Our newspapers have traditionally been a guarantee that truth will reach every part of our own country and all the free peoples of the world. I have heard you referred to as a one-party

press. If this is true, I do trust that the slogan, the purpose, the aim of your party is to spread the truth. If that is so, I apply for membership. Never was it more important than it is today that the people of the entire world have free access to the truth.

Recently I read a story about one particular segment of the newspaper community of America and how it helped spread the truth even beyond the barriers devised against its communication-into the homes of the Communist-dominated lands.

Some twenty thousand newspaper boys voluntarily conducted a fund-raising campaign for the Crusade for Freedom. That Crusade brings truth to those behind the Iron Curtain, to people who otherwise could not have it. Of course, the boys' campaign is not one of the normal functions of the American newspapers-but the incident gives heartening evidence of newspaper people's unflagging interest in the maintenance of freedom and of human hope for peace.

Certainly, I am inspired by the knowledge that boys of this nation will freely give of their time and their energy--and more important, their hearts--to help bring information of today's world to those whose masters provide them nothing but propaganda.

In this day, every resource of free men must be mustered if we are to remain free; every bit of our wit, our courage and our dedication must be mobilized if we are to achieve genuine peace. There is no age nor group nor race that cannot somehow help.

Just over two years ago I had an opportunity to appear before the American Society of Newspaper Editors. I then pledged your Government to an untiring search for a just peace as a fixed and abiding objective. In our search for peace we are not bound by slavish adherence to precedent or halted by the lack of it. The spirit of this search influences every action of your Administration; it affects every solution to problems of the moment.

It prompted my proposal before the General Assembly of the United Nations that governments make joint contributions of fissionable materials to an International Atomic Energy Agency for peaceful research--so that the miraculous inventiveness of man may be consecrated to his fuller life.

It inspired last week's offer of polio information, research facilities and seed virus--so that Dr. Salk's historic accomplishment may free all mankind from a physical scourge.

It provides the reason for a plan that, after lengthy study, I am able now to announce. We have added to the United States Program for Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy an atomic-powered merchant ship. The Atomic Energy Commission and the Maritime Administration are now developing specifications. I shall shortly submit to the Congress a request for the necessary funds, together with a description of the vessel.

The new ship, powered with an atomic reactor, will not require refueling for scores of thousands of miles of operation. Visiting the ports of the world, it will demonstrate to people everywhere this peacetime use of atomic energy, harnessed for the improvement of human living. In part, also, the ship will be an atomic exhibit; carrying to all people practical knowledge of the usefulness of this new science in such fields as medicine, agriculture and power production.

The search for peace likewise underlies the plan developed for expanding foreign trade

embodied in H.R. No. 1 now before the Congress.

In every possible way, in word and in deed, we shall strive to bring to all men the truth of our assertion that we seek only a just and a lasting peace.

There is no precedent for the nature of the struggle of our time.

Every day, in our newspapers, we are confronted with what is probably the greatest paradox of history.

Out of an instinctive realization of the horror of nuclear war the hunger of virtually every human being on this planet is for tranquil security, for an opportunity to live and to let live, for freedom, for peace. And yet, defying this universal hunger, certain dictatorships have engaged in a deliberately conceived drive which periodically creates alarms and fears of war.

In our uneasy postwar world, crises are a recurrent international diet; their climaxes come and go. But so they have--in some degree--since the beginning of organized society. By their effect on human action, the peril within them is either magnified or diminished.

A crisis may be fatal when, by it, unstable men are stampeded into headlong panic. Then--bereft of common sense and wise judgment--they too hastily resort to armed force in the hope of crushing a threatening foe, although thereby they impoverish the world and may forfeit the hope for enduring peace.

But a crisis may likewise be deadly when inert men--unsure of themselves and their cause--are smothered in despair. Then, grasping at any straw of appeasement, they sell a thousand tomorrows for the pottage of a brief escape from reality.

But a crisis is also the sharpest goad to the creative energies of men, particularly when they recognize it as a challenge to their very resource, and move to meet it in faith, in thought, in courage. Then, greatly aroused--yet realizing that beyond the immediate danger lie vast horizons--they can act for today in the light of generations still to come.

The American people, one hundred sixty-four million of us, must recognize that the unprecedented crises of these days-packed with danger though they may be--are in fullest truth challenges that can be met and will be met to the lasting good of our country and to the world.

Two great American objectives are mountain peaks that tower above the foothills of lesser goals. One is global peace based on justice, mutual respect and cooperative partnership among the nations. The other is an expanding American economy whose benefits, widely shared among all our citizens, will make us even better able to cooperate with other friendly nations in their economic advancement and our common prosperity.

The fundamental hazard to the achievement of both objectives is the implacable enmity of godless communism. That hazard becomes the more fearsome as we are guilty of failure among ourselves; failure to seek out and face facts courageously; failure to make required sacrifices for the common good; failure to look beyond our selfish interests of the moment; failure to seek long-term betterment for all our citizens.

Recognizing the ruthless purposes of international communism, we must assure, above all else,

our own national safety. At the same time we must continue to appeal to the sense of logic and decency of all peoples to work with us in the development of some kind of sane arrangement for peace.

But when a nation speaks alone, its appeal may fall on deaf ears. Many nations must combine their voices to penetrate walls of fear and prejudice, and selfishness and ignorance.

The principal objective of our foreign policy, therefore, as we search for peace, is the construction of the strongest possible coalition among free nations. The coalition must possess spiritual, intellectual, material strength.

In things spiritual, the common effort must be inspired by fairness and justice, by national pride and self-respect. It must be based on the inalienable fights of the individual who--made in the image of his Creator--is endowed with a dignity and destiny immeasurable by the materialistic yardstick of communism.

In things intellectual, the coalition must manifest such common sense and evident logic that all nations may see in it an opportunity to benefit themselves. Certainly, it must proclaim the right of all men to strive for their own betterment--and it must foster their exercise of that right.

In things material, the friendly partnership must be sinewed by expanded economies within all its member nations, mutually benefiting by a growing trade volume that must be joined in realization that their security interdependence is paralleled by their economic interdependence.By sound economic thinking and action, we Americans can hasten the achievement of both our great goals--peace among the nations; a widely shared prosperity at home.

We have an unmatched production system. But even our economy will not thrive if confined to our own land. So to sustain our own prosperity and economic growth we must strengthen the economic bonds between us and others of the free world. Thus we confront the communist with a vast and voluntary partnership of vigorous, expanding national economies whose aggregate power and productivity, always increasing, can never be successfully challenged by the communist world.

The issue is clean-cut. Either we foster flourishing trade between the free nations or we weaken the free world and our own economy. Unless trade links these nations together, our foreign policy will be encased in a sterile vacuum; our domestic economy will shrink within its continental fences. The enlargement of mutually beneficial trade in the free world is an objective to which all of us should be fully dedicated.

Ours is the most dynamic economy yet devised by man, a progress-sharing economy whose advance benefits every man, woman and child living within it.

Last year, our Gross National Product exceeded 357 billion dollars. Twenty years ago few would have believed such an achievement even a remote possibility.

Nevertheless, continuation of current rates of increase will bring us by 1965 to 500 billion dollars or more as our Gross National Product. This will mean a tremendous advance in the living standards of the American people.

But a 500 billion dollar economy by 1965 can be achieved only within the framework of a healthy and expanding free world economy.

Trade expands markets for the increased output of our mines, our farms and our factories. In return we obtain essential raw materials and needed products of the farms and factories of others. Likewise, the markets provided here for the products of other free world countries enable them to acquire from us capital equipment and consumer goods essential to their economic development and higher living standards.

American agriculture sells abroad from one-fourth to one-third of major crops such as wheat, cotton and tobacco. Without these export markets there can be, under current conditions, no enduring prosperity for the American farmer.

American factories and labor likewise have an important stake in foreign trade. Last year this country sold over 9 billion dollars of industrial products abroad. Over 3 million workers-American workers--are directly dependent on exports for their jobs. Jungles the world round are being tamed today by American bulldozers; new mines are being opened by our drills and equipment; fields that have been cultivated by hand for centuries are yielding new harvests to our agricultural machines; our automobiles, trucks and buses are found wherever there are roads; and new industries to employ the teeming millions within the underdeveloped nations are being equipped with our machine tools.

The expansion of our foreign trade should proceed on an orderly basis. Reductions in tariffs and other trade barriers, both here and abroad, must be gradual, selective and reciprocal. Changes which would result in the threat of serious injury to industry or general reduction in employment would not strengthen the economy of this country or the free world. The trade measures that I have recommended to the Congress were prepared in recognition of these facts.

Now, to abandon our program for the gradual reduction of unjustifiable trade barriers--to vitiate the Administration proposals by crippling amendments--would strike a severe blow at the cooperative efforts of the free nations to build up their economic and military defenses. It could result in increasing discrimination against our exports. It could lead to widespread trade restrictions and a sharp contraction in world trade. This would mean lowered production and employment at home. It could mean a retreat to economic nationalism and isolationism. It would constitute a serious setback to our hopes for global peace.Two-way trade, I believe, is a broad avenue by which all men and all nations of good will can travel toward a golden age of peace and plenty. Your Administration is committed to help building it. I personally believe it is to the common good of all 164 million of our people and I shall not relax my personal effort towards its achievement.

We shall succeed, given the support of all who unaffrighted by crises--are prepared to act on today's problems while they work for tomorrow's better and happier life. The accomplishment of this goal is worthy of the best effort of all Americans. Through you--you who gather here--and all your associates dedicated to the mission of spreading the truth, a more rapid progress can be made.

As we build a richer material world, we must always remember that there are spiritual truths which endure forever. They are the universal inspiration of all mankind. In them, men of both the

free world and the communist world could well find guidance. Do we remember those words of our faith--"All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them"?

Do we remind ourselves that a similar thread of peaceful and lofty exhortation reveals itself in the words of every one of the world's historic religious leaders? Every one of them--their followers today people great nations.

The Far East, the Middle East, the Near East, the West--Asia and Africa and Europe and the American hemisphere--all alike possess in their heritage the same universal ideal. Why then should we permit pessimism to slow our efforts; despair to darken our spirits?

Cannot we convince ourselves and others that in cooperation there is strength?

Cannot you, men and women of the pen, propagate knowledge of economic truth just as your professional forebears spread the truths that inspired our forefathers to achieve a national independence? For when all people, everywhere, understand that international trade--peaceful trade--is a fertile soil for the growth of a shared prosperity, of all kinds of cooperative strength, and of understanding and tolerance, the fruits thereof will be another historic step on the road to universal peace.

I thank you, President McLean and ladies and gentlemen, for the honor you have accorded me by allowing me to appear before you.

(81) President's Press Conference April 27, 1955 [President Eisenhower's sixty-sixth news conference was held in the Executive Office Building from 10:31 to 11:06am, in attendance: 189.]

EL-Dl6-66 (PC)

[This is a complete transcript of the news conference of this date. All of the President's replies were released for broadcasting or direct quotation at that time.]

Q. Marvin L. Arrowsmith, Associated Press: Mr. President, between last Saturday and yesterday this Government seems to have changed its mind some about insisting that Nationalist China participate in any discussions between the United States and Red China concerning the Formosa area, at least with respect to a cease-fire. Can you tell us why the change, if you regard it as a change?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think the change is far more apparent than real. Last Saturday it was stated we were not going to talk about the affairs of Nationalist China except with them present. I believe that Mr. Dulles made this point clear also at his own press conference, saying we would not discuss the affairs of the Chinese Nationalists behind their back; but that as a test of good intent, if the Chi-Com wanted to talk merely about cease-fire, we would be glad to meet with them and talk with them, but there would be no conferring about the affairs of the Chinese Nationalists. So I think that the one statement may have erred in not being as complete as it should have been, but I don't believe it was a reversal of attitude.

Q. Robert E. Clark, International News Service: Mr. President, there have been reports that you have been in private communication with Marshal Zhukov and have asked him, among other

things, to use his good offices to help obtain the release of American flyers imprisoned by Red China; is that correct?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, it is correct that I had some personal correspondence, but it was because of the nature of our two positions and based upon old friendship. It was absolutely personal. I am not at liberty to say what was in it until he releases it. I assure you there is nothing in it that was of such a great significance that it ought to disturb anybody, but it was personal.

Q. David P. Sentner, Hearst Newspapers: Mr. President, do your remarks in the previous question on Red China mean that any discussion with Communist China will be limited to cease-fire discussions, or possibly the release of the American prisoners?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, you are correct in making the observation. Anything that doesn't affect the Chinese Nationalists, and there seems to be an opportunity for us to further the easing of tensions, the advancement of world peace, and certainly getting back our prisoners, of course we would talk about it. I merely meant to say that when it comes to talking about the affairs that involve our ally bound to us by treaty we are not going to talk behind their backs. That was the one caveat I put on the answer.

Q. Laurence H. Burd, Chicago Tribune: Mr. President, do we have any assurance or any indication that Nationalist China would agree to a cease-fire if Red China did; and was that one of the topics of the Admiral Radford-Robertson mission in Formosa?

THE PRESIDENT. You open up a subject that every time a man tries to make an answer he runs the risk of one word giving a false impression. But so far as I know, the Chinese Nationalists are not firing now except in defense of the territories they are now occupying. They are not attacking the mainland, so far as I know, except in retaliation. Consequently, I believe that a cease-fire on their side would be purely academic. They are firing only in defense, as I understand. But that was not any special item that had come up, so I can't give you any more accurate answer than that one.

Q. Kenneth M. Scheibel, Gannett Newspapers: Mr. President, would you care to comment on the work of the Congress so far?

THE PRESIDENT. I talked about the matter with some of my friends on the Hill within the last two days, and they said it was too early. They said you never know how a Congress is going to--what is going to be its schedule and its rate of performance, and they said you just can't really talk about it yet.

Q. Mrs. May Craig, Maine Papers: Mr. President, are you saying that a cease-fire is not of interest to the Nationalist Chinese or that you will talk with them separately about a cease-fire?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, Mrs. Craig, I didn't say that it was of no interest to them. I did say they are not fighting at this moment. Therefore, a cease-fire is purely on the Chi-Com's part. Therefore we can talk to the Chi-Coms about their own firing without damaging the interests of the Chinese Nationalists; that is all.

Q. Raymond P. Brandt, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: Mr. President, does the postponement of the administration's testimony on the Bricker amendment mean that you are thinking in terms of a

substitute or a compromise?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, when you say "compromise," Mr. Brandt, of course, you can mean anything, and it could mean anything to anybody else. I think I have made my position perfectly clear on this subject before this group. I have not changed my mind one iota. The Constitution had as one of its principal reasons for coming into being the conduct of the foreign affairs of the United States as a single unit, not as 48 States. I believe I quoted something of one of the treaties, 1783 treaty, I believe it was, by which the British were going to evacuate certain of our forts on the Northwest Frontier. Then some of the Colonies decided, because we were then under the Confederation you will remember, that they just would not obey those treaties. So the British didn't evacuate the forts, and we were almost at war again. In foreign affairs the United States is a single nation meeting with others. It is not 48 meeting with others, and we must not forget it. So we must never agree to any kind of arrangement that would weaken this position vis-a-vis the other nations of the world, which means weakening the provisions now in the Constitution for conducting foreign affairs. Now, on the other hand, I have equally said the United States has gotten a great fear that treaties can be written that are in violation of the Constitution. And if it would reassure the people of the United States to have an amendment saying that any treaty or executive agreement in conflict with this Constitution shall have no force or effect, I am perfectly willing to say it. But I will go no further. Now, that is my opinion about the amendment.

Q. James B. Reston, New York Times: In the statement that was issued, sir, on Saturday, the State Department said: "In the Formosa region we have an ally in the free Republic of China, and of course the United States would insist on Free China participating as an equal in any discussions concerning the area."

THE PRESIDENT. That might be a touch of an overstatement because I have agreed with what Mr. Dulles said. I agreed with it before he said it. I believe it is perfectly legitimate for us to talk to the ChiComs about stopping firing. Now, if we overstated the case Saturday, well, that was to that extent an error in terminology.

Q. Clark R. Mollenhoff, Des Moines Register: Your information policies in the Defense Department have been under some rather severe criticism by editors in the last few weeks. I wondered if you would like to comment on that and what part you had, if any, in formulating those policies. VA trained intelligence system can get a terrific source of information out of the combined documents that can be procured on the newsstands and the libraries of the United States. Now, that is as it should be because to inform ourselves, we have to be ready to inform others. But we do not need to turn out such things as an airplane able to fly straight up or to do some other thing that seems to be a strange new principle. It is that to which I object, and that only.

Q. Mr. Mollenhoff: Mr. President, there seems to be some order that states that what information comes out must be to the benefit of the armed services, and this creates some confusion as to what information is to the benefit.

THE PRESIDENT. Of that I never heard. You will have to go back to Mr. Wilson and question him.

Q. Joseph R. Slevin, New York Journal of Commerce: In view of fears that declines in automobile production and home building may cause a dip in business activity after midyear, could you give us the administration's views of economic prospects for the balance of 1955?

THE PRESIDENT. Of course, I meet with economists and others of the administration on these subjects all the time.The economist--his expert advice would be that you should seek the highest rate of production and prosperity that can be sustained, but don't get into a false rush and then fall back; that unjustified rises are to be followed by immediate drops is not true prosperity and doesn't bring about the feeling of confidence we want. So they watch them. All I can say is no one has uttered to me the fears you express in terms of earnest warnings. They have said: "These are facts and it looks like we have got to be very watchful and careful." As you know, the Federal Reserve Board the other day, so far as the stock market is concerned, raised the margin requirements another 10 percent, I think more as a red flag to the business community and others than as any thought that it would have a direct effect.

Q. Sarah McClendon, El Paso Times: Sir, are we correct in assuming that you did approve this Millikin-Byrd substitute to the Neely amendment which the Senate Finance Committee approved last night?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes. The one about the general authority of the President in case--yes. As a matter of fact, I think it was a very fine one.

Q. Mrs. McClendon: Yes, sir. Well, now, Senator Lyndon Johnson interprets that to mean for the first time in history we will have full authority in the President to decide if imports of foreign crude are interfering with national defense and hurting the domestic oil industry. Is that the way you would interpret it, not only to apply it to oil but to all commodities?

THE PRESIDENT. I doubt whether I would answer it as a hypothetical case. I would say this: in everything that the President does in this field he must take into consideration the standing of all America, 164 million people. One of the greatest functions of all that 164 millions is their own protection. There is never any one of these cases that comes up in any way where the question of national security doesn't enter. Now, here they have merely mentioned specifically the question of national security, but it is a matter that is almost inherent in the function itself.

Q. Ray L. Scherer, National Broadcasting Company: Mr. President, the broad picture. Do you see any signs, any tangible signs, of a general abatement of tension between East and West, and if so, could you enumerate them?THE PRESIDENT. George Patton used to say that no man is a soldier unless he has a sixth sense, and then he would describe that sixth sense. It was, I must say--for him it seemed to work--it was suddenly to make your decisions on your own guess, and throw all of the G-2 people out the window. Now, I will confess I have the feeling that things are on the upswing. But I can take every single favorable point and balance it by something that doesn't look too favorable. But I do believe this: more of the world is beginning finally to have confidence that the United States is not trying to establish a new form of colonialism, doing it just through purchases, money, and economic penetration. I believe that they are beginning to understand the United States is genuinely devoted to peace, that we are a peaceful people who want full opportunity to develop ourselves, and that in going along they are beginning to see that our efforts to help others have had not only our own enlightened self-interest as an inspiration, but also the knowledge that others must advance if we are to continue to do so. This you see

coming out in a number of ways. Suddenly Russia says: "We are ready to conclude this Austrian Treaty now." Or, the tension seems to die down in some other area. But, at the same time, you will see a build-up of airplanes around the Formosa area, on the Chinese mainland. You will see your trouble in South Viet-Nam. So, as you sit and live with these things you have a very difficult time proving anything either way. But I do say, I still have my feelings.

Q. Charles S. von Fremd, CBS News: Mr. President, you just mentioned, sir, the Russian move in Austria. A few weeks ago you mentioned that as one of a series of possibilities that might be a sign of Russian good faith of deeds not words, which might, in turn, be a factor in a decisive meeting at the summit, or an eventual Big Four meeting. Do you feel that way now, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. I don't know whether it will lead to the Big Four meeting in terms of the heads of states, or heads, at least, of governments. I do mean this: it is a step. Already there has been agreed that the ambassadors will meet in Vienna. Assuming that meeting will be successful, we will know then the Big Four will meet then in terms of their foreign ministers. And if that leads to something that might demand higher concurrence, it is possible. But I say at this moment I see no reason for that summit meeting. But, as I say, anything might grow out of it.

Q. Edward T. Folliard, Washington Post and Times Herald: Mr. President, the 10th anniversary of V-E Day is coming up. Do you have any reflections on that event?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, yes. Of course, I think we knew 6 weeks before that that victory was certain and was coming very quickly. It merely became a question of the day. But I think May 8th [9th] represented for a great many people in Europe at that time practically the realization of all their dreams and, you might say, their ambitions. Certainly I thought it marked for me, you might say, the end of an active career. I saw a nice farm over the other side of the ocean--and it still is a long ways away, isn't it? [Laughter] After all, when you are my age, 21 months is still a long time. [Laughter] I do believe this: I believe that there was in the hearts of all the fighting men, all of the people that were in uniform in Europe on that day, I believe there was a genuine desire for peace and the hope that there would be no more war. That hope has not been realized. It has encountered its defeats, but I still believe it is a mighty force in the world, and I favor it. I don't hesitate to write or communicate with old friends that I knew in those days in an effort to get them to try to help us advance one step along the road. To refer again to my old friend Marshal Zhukov, I believe he was intently devoted to the idea of promoting good relations between the United States and the Soviet Union at that time. As I say, I haven't seen him since November of 1945. But in other instances, the Frenchmen and the Britishers and the others that I knew, I still am in close contact with them. But I must say this: I wish that in this cold war we could now get some victory that would make us feel as good as we did that day of May 1945.

Q. Andrew F. Tully, Jr., Scripps-Howard: Mr. President, are you going to attend the U.N. meeting in San Francisco?

THE PRESIDENT. The answer has not been finally and completely developed, but I would say the chances for me going are very, very poor.

Q. Mr. Tully: Poor, did you say?

THE PRESIDENT. Very poor; because I have got other engagements that are very pressing at that time.

Q. Roscoe Drummond, New York Herald Tribune: Mr. President, in a broadcast for use behind the Iron Curtain for radio liberation, the Vice President expressed a view this week that the greatest barrier to peace was the fact that the Soviet people are still held in tyranny by their own government. I wondered if you would say whether you share that view, or would like to elaborate on it?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think it is a little speculative. After men's minds have become persuaded of the truth of something, though it be wrong, they can support that idea if they believe it to be true. Now, we don't know how far the Soviet leaders have succeeded in persuading their people that communism is, in fact, an ideal existence. And I should say that if you had tried to establish in this country communism as of 1917, there would still be such a seething unrest in this country, such a determination, that it would long ago have disappeared. So just how violent may be any mass resentment to this domination we really don't know, and I think that it would be idle to speculate.

Q. Robert J. Donovan, New York Herald Tribune: Sir, without going into the substance of your letter to Marshal Zhukov, could you tell us when it was sent and how and about, whether it was very long or not?

THE PRESIDENT. You sound to me like you ought to turn into being a Sherlock Holmes. [Laughter] Well, it was, I would say, recently. As a matter of fact, I don't remember the exact date, but within the last three weeks.

Q. John Kenton, New York Journal of Commerce: Mr. President, while we are waiting for the details of your atomic ship proposal to be worked out in detail, I wonder if you could tell us a little bit about the background of how the plan came to be worked out and, specifically, whether the idea originated with a Government official or in a suggestion from private industry.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, now, I have warned you people plenty of times that when you go to begin a search for the initiation of an idea, the memory can play you very, very sad tricks. I think that as far as bringing this thing forward as a proposal to do something about it, I think it was mine. And any of you people check me differently. Mr. Hagerty: That is right.THE PRESIDENT. But I really can't say that. I think it makes little difference. The administration learned, through its technical experts, not only that it was possible--we knew it was possible the second that the test model for the Nautilus was successfully tested--but there came the idea: now, suppose we had a merchant ship? And then we made some studies what it would cost, and admitted it was going to cost more than another kind. But what value would this have, particularly in the effort to get the whole world to understanding that the peaceful uses of atomic energy could, under favorable circumstances, far overshadow its destructive force? Then it began to loom up as possibly one of the finest ways, because when you think of the great cities and the millions that live on the seacoast, this ship could start out and visit almost every port in the world before it came back. Well, that sounded like a very good idea. And so we adopted the idea one day at a meeting--I forget what meeting it was-and they are going after the specifications. The plan will go before the Congress as soon as it can be worked out in sufficient detail.

Q. John L. Cutter, United Press: Mr. President, in connection with this matter of Government information there have been some complaints about the press not being permitted to cover a conference at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

THE PRESIDENT. I asked about it, and they are covering one this morning.

Q. Milton B. Freudenheim, Akron Beacon Journal: Mr. President, last week the Defense Department abolished the requirement that key workers in defense industries be required to name friends and relatives who are members of Communist fronts; and recently also Attorney General Brownell announced that the witnesses, former Communist witnesses, would no longer stay on the payroll as consultants. This looks like it might be a change in emphasis in the internal security field. Would you comment?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I will have to defer the question. You will have to hunt up the facts. I haven't heard of that, and it is brand new to me.

Q. John Herling, Editors Syndicate: This has to do, Mr. President, with the minimum wages. Since the administration bill for 90-cent minimum was introduced several months ago, all bills introduced since by Republicans and Democrats--there have been about nearly 50 on the same subject--call for at least a dollar minimum. In view of this development, do you see any possibility of the administration changing its position, or do you think it will remain inflexible on the subject?

THE PRESIDENT. The subject was studied a long time, brought up before the Cabinet, of course, by the Secretary of Labor, and with all of the charts showing the reasons for changes. Since the minimum wage was fixed at 75 cents, the cost of living has gone up sufficiently to justify a rise in the minimum wage to, I believe it was, 86.4. Now, I am not going to take my oath on that, but it was close to that. So we decided that 90 cents was a good round figure, would be over and above that. We said it should go higher, but we wanted to put our emphasis, if this were possible, on the spreading of this minimum wage rather than raising it, because the minimum wage today in any covered industry affects very, very few people. But there are many, many thousands working who are not covered by the minimum wage field at all. We would like to see a spread rather than just the rise, because we don't think the rise is so meaningful.

Q. Edward P. Morgan, American Broadcasting Company: Mr. President, what can you tell us, sir, of this Government's views now towards the sticky situation in Viet-Nam and, particularly, whether the Government thinks there may be the necessity to change the policy of recognition of Premier Diem?

THE PRESIDENT. I can't give you any final answer because, as you know, it is still under discussion. We have called General Collins back here, a man in whom we have the greatest of confidence and who has been right in the thick of things out there, and who has been supporting, of course, Premier Diem. Now, there have occurred lots of difficulties. People have left the Cabinet, and so on. You know what most of those difficulties are. It is a strange and it is almost an inexplicable situation, at least from our viewpoint. But he has come back because we have up not only the need to clarify ideas as to future policy, but there is the question of aid for Asia. His testimony, of course, would be valuable not only to us, but he will testify before committees on the Hill. What the exact terms of our future policy will be, I can't say.

Q. Elie Abel, New York Times: Could you give us your reaction, sir, to the recent statement of former President Truman that the press is treating you with special tenderness and granting to you an immunity which some of your predecessors--

THE PRESIDENT. I can only say if you are, thank you. [Laughter] Listen, I am not above saying that I often need friendly treatment.

Q. Benjamin R. Cole, Indianapolis Star: Mr. President, could you tell us what role you believe the Federal Government should play in the polio vaccine program?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think that they have tackled it correctly. I believe very greatly in the power that can be developed by the humanitarian agencies of this country when they work together in cooperation. And if they have the direction which is to be given them through the Advisory Committee set up in Mrs. Hobby's Department, I believe that we will get the most rapid possible distribution of this vaccine. Now, the reason I opposed originally at least--any compulsory role for the Federal Government, I believe it would slow it up. By the time you established more bureaus and all of the rest of the stuff, I believe you would be in trouble.I believe it is going just as fast as it can. I get the reports--I think by August first, as I recall, they believe a hundred percent of the children from 1 to 9 will be vaccinated. And by November first, I think, a hundred percent of those up to 19. There will be six companies producing this. They will put it into a pool, and this Advisory Committee will lay out the priorities in which it is to go out, and I suppose with a careful eye--I know with a careful eye for any threatened emergency or anything of that sort. We will certainly do the best we can. I would not hesitate to use any power of government, if necessary. I just believe that others can do it better.

Q. Cabell Phillips, New York Times: Mr. President, I have two questions on the refugee program.

THE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Q. Mr. Phillips: First, sir, would you express whether or not you are satisfied with the way the refugee program is now operating? And, second, whether or not you will support proposed revisions of the Refugee Act which have now been introduced in the Senate--I am not sure of the House.

THE PRESIDENT. The answer to the first question is no. The next one is yes.

Q. Joseph Chiang, Chinese News Service: Do you think Chinese Communists now realize America sincerely believes in peace so that she humbly came to America for help to seek peace?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, you are asking me to interpret people who are a very long ways away and with whom I am not too well acquainted.I would say this: I take their words with reservations, but with hope. Does that answer your question?

Q. John M. Hightower, Associated Press: Mr. President, can you tell us whether you initiated your correspondence with Marshal Zhukov and whether you had an answer from him?

THE PRESIDENT. I believe I shall say no more about that at the moment, and for a very definite reason. Ladies and gentlemen, if someone abroad writes to me on a personal basis he expects to have that confidence observed. Now, I think every person in this room would want that correspondence, if it were humanly possible, to lead to some betterment of the world situation. I don't know whether it ever can, but it is a slim hope. It is one of those points we must preserve. I am not going to violate his confidence in saying who initiated this correspondence.

Q. Lloyd M. Schwartz, Fairchild Publications: Mr. President, in regard to the trade bill, as approved by the Finance Committee, I wondered whether you found anything objectionable in the revision of the escape clause provision.

THE PRESIDENT. I haven't read it. But I did have time this morning for one brief conversation with one of my staff who said there were a couple of amendments put on that will take a little bit of study to see whether we can accept them entirely. Now, I didn't even have time to find out what they were, I am sorry.

Q. Roscoe Drummond, New York Herald Tribune: Mr. President, may I ask a brief question about this matter of making military information easy or too easy for an enemy to get? May I ask whether you feel entirely relaxed about the pamphlet issued by the Republican Policy Committee of the Senate detailing information about new weapons and related military information?

THE PRESIDENT. I heard about this pamphlet just before I came over. They gave me some idea that made me think that there had been a blunder that occurred. Now, for the past 2 years--I say "a blunder"; somebody, I think, gave out information that I wouldn't have given out, at least. For some 2 years and 3 months I have been plagued by inexplicable, undiscovered leaks in this Government. But we mustn't be too astonished when we recognize the great numbers of people in this town who necessarily know details of one kind or another. I just don't believe that it is justifiable for any governmental official to release anything that applies to the secret war plans, war policies, war purposes and war equipment of this Government. That is the kind of thing that foreign intelligence systems spend thousands and thousands of dollars to get, unless we give it to them for nothing. And since we don't get it for nothing, I just don't believe in that kind of a trade. Now, this is what I believe in giving away: I think today to hold secret any document of the World War, including my own mistakes, except only when they are held there by some past agreement with a foreign nation that has not yet been abrogated, it is foolish. Everything ought to be given out that helps the public of the United States to profit from past mistakes, to make decisions of the moment; that is current information. But this is one thing. I say it doesn't help any of us to make a decision merely to know that a plane can fly 802 miles instead of 208. That is a secret we should not be giving out. That is the kind of thing I am talking about, and that only, I assure you.

John L. Cutter, United Press: Thank you, Mr. President.

(83) Remarks to the Committee for a National Trade Policy Following Congressional Action on the Proposed Trade Agreements Extension Act April 28, 1955 [The President spoke in the Rose Garden at 3pm.]

EL-Dl6-31 (IR)

SINCE you people already know what I think about this, I see very little reason in saying anything except "Thank you," saying that in every language that I know, using every word and every expression, because I am truly grateful. There, of course, have been encouraging developments. The bill having just passed the House, and, after long study and examination in Senate Committee to have come out 13 to 2--at least in its general features--I thought was a tremendous victory. And I know how much you people have had to do with it.

Whatever we do in this regard, though, we must always remember that in projects affecting

human affairs, victories are never really won because life is an unending fight, and everything that applies to the welfare of humans is something that goes on and progresses. We never wholly conquer disease. We never wholly conquer ignorance. We will never have perfection. So that there will always be a struggle going on to balance against the hope of immediate and sometimes selfish gain the long-term good of a great nation and of a whole world. That is the kind of thing in which you have engaged yourselves and along which you have come so far already.

But it will continue. I merely beg of you not to look at any one skirmish as a victory in a campaign or in a war. As you know, the administration is dedicated in many ways not only through H.R. 1 but through other plans and methods to breaking down barriers--tiresome and burdensome customs procedures and all the rest of it--around the world. The administration is dedicated not only to promote trade between ourselves and another country, but between those countries as among themselves, so as to increase our prosperity and make them better customers of OURS.

I really believe that in this whole field of international trade, we must think of it as the greatest instrument or weapon in the hands of the diplomat as he strives to promote peace. We must think of it also as the connecting/ink, really, between a prosperous economy here at home, widely shared, and a growing and stronger free world capable of marching without fear of attack, fear of any kind of interference on the part of potential enemies. toward a better and a brighter future for all of us. So, believing those things so deeply in my heart, you can understand that I don't really have the words in which to say "thank you" adequately. But I do assure you I mean it.

Good luck to all of you.

(84) Remarks at the Cornerstone Laying Ceremony for the American Federation of Labor Building April 30, 1955

[President's opening words "President Meany" referred to George Meany, President, American Federation of Labor.]

EL-Dl6-32 (IR)

President Meany, ladies and gentlemen:

I take it as right neighborly that you, President Meany, and your associates should ask me to come across from the other side of Lafayette Square, where I have a temporary leasehold, to visit you on this historic occasion at the place which we hope will be your permanent home for many, many years to come. I came for a number of reasons, among which were an opportunity again to salute that great and vast army of Americans who with their hands produce our material wealth; to return friendly calls that have been made to my office by leaders of the labor movement; and likewise because I read this in the letter of President Meany asking me to be here.

He said, "We have constantly observed the principle of placing our responsibilities as American citizens above our obligations and duties as members of labor unions." So far as I am concerned that is the philosophy that should guide the American of every calling, no matter what it is--to place the long-term good of America, all America, above any immediate and selfish reason. And in that spirit, I salute this group of leaders and every single individual that belongs to the labor movement, and indeed all labor in America.

President Meany, in his address, adverted to the previous occasion of the laying of a cornerstone for the American Federation of Labor, and he spoke of President Wilson being here. President Wilson said, among other things, on that occasion: "If you come at me with your fist doubled up, you will find that I will double mine no less swiftly than you do yours. But if you come to me in the spirit of friendliness and negotiation, you will find that I will say, 'Come let us sit down together and there, I assure you, we shall find that our differences are far more imaginary than real.'"

Now again I believe that on that occasion, Mr. Wilson spoke something that all Americans should well heed. Because we shall never be rid of strife in this world--international and, in some degree among ourselves, so long as humans are human and the millennium has not arrived. But the character of men and the character of nations will be determined by the method in which they meet to solve their differences. If we acknowledge that the difference is honestly agreed, then let us meet in what we like to term the Christian spirit and reach an answer that is for the good of all. It seems to me that Mr. Wilson spoke something that was worthy then of the great man, Samuel Gompers, who as your President, was worthy of the entire movement that we call the American labor movement.

For myself, I should like to tell you again, I am no stranger to work. Mr. Meany referred to a terrible 60-hour week. I reminded him several times that when I finally was fortunate enough to enter the Army, my workweek just before that was 84 hours, and it was 52 weeks a year. I certainly can appreciate what the labor movement has done for the men and women of America and what we must continue to do to make certain that this growing and advancing prosperity is widely shared so that all may participate in it.

Finally, President Meany made a pledge. And he used the words of Samuel Gompers in a great pledge to President Wilson.In return, I can say only this: so far as the Almighty will give to this administration and to me personally the ability to discern the proper tasks, we shall do nothing but devote our efforts to try to lead this world--this Nation of ours--toward enduring peace, toward a better prosperity and equal justice for all here at home.

Now in conclusion, may I say I am not only pleased, I am very proud that this great assembly--this great association--soon to become greater by its junction with another great organization, will by that measure have still greater responsibilities in carrying out the kind of pledges that have been made by your leaders of the past, and I am sure are earnestly followed by your leaders at this moment.I am proud to be here, and to participate in this ceremony.

Thank you all very much.

Note: The pledge made by Samuel Gompers, first President of the AFL, at the dedication of the headquarters on July 4, 1916, and repeated by Mr. Meany, follows: "Let us do all that we can to help the man at the head of the affairs of our country, the President of the United States, to see to it that we are kept out of actual war with any Nation. Be true to yourselves, true to each other, true to the organized labor movement, true to the institutions and the flag of our country, which we shall uphold at all times and against all obstacles no matter from which quarter they may come."

(85) Remarks at the Annual Meeting of the United States Chamber of Commerce May 2, 1955

[The President spoke at Constitution Hall at 11:30am. His opening words "Mr. President"

referred to Clement D. Johnston, President of the US Chamber of Commerce.]

EL-Dl6-32 (IR)

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen:

It is indeed a great honor to welcome you here to the Capital City and to have the privilege of spending with you these few minutes.

The very word "commerce" is filled with connotations characteristic of our problems of the day. Commerce based upon the productivity, the energies, and the brains of men likewise provides that material base to satisfy the material and physical wants of man and on which are built those opportunities for cultural and spiritual advancement so necessary to his well being, his progress, and his happiness.

Commerce here at home has made us what we are. As I was driving over here a few minutes ago, there crossed my mind a speculation. A hundred years ago today, Franklin Pierce was President. Had he been invited to a body with similar functions, aspirations, and purposes as yours, what would he have talked about?

Well, railroads were beginning to come in. We knew something of steamships, but largely even our farms and certainly our communities were self-supporting. Commerce as such had not attained for people the tremendous significance that it has in this modern day, when almost every man and every community are specialists. The man is a machinist, the city is a steel city such as Gary or Pittsburgh, or an automobile city such at Detroit, or an agricultural town such as Abilene, Kansas. But everybody does something and produces something in the way of services that must go to someone else, or they have no value and bring no profit to the producer.

Commerce, its free propagation and progress in this country, has brought today the great organism--this great institution that we call modern America.

Now it has done that without the desertion of the basic principles that were applicable 100 years ago--as well as 177 years ago when our documents--our founding document was written. We still believe that, in the aggregate, the initiative of the individual, his aspirations and his hope of bettering himself and his family--his ambitions--if directed equally toward the common good as toward his own betterment, will produce the greatest good for all of us.

And though today we talk about a greater need for governmental relationships with the private individual, and with business, and with our various localities, yet we forget that basic principle at our peril, and we must not--ever--no matter what we hope for in the way of advantage from governmental regulation or direction, or any kind of regimentation, we must never accept it if it means the surrender of this vital principle: of living by our own initiative and our individual freedoms to develop ourselves physically, intellectually, and spiritually.

Now the point I should like to make is this. We have proved these things here at home. We understand them thoroughly. The point I want to make, then, is they are just as vital internationally as they are nationally.

It is true we do not accept and need not accept any overall governmental structure that will take

the place in international life that our Federal Government takes in our own living. But think of the things you do by cooperation and by working together. That is the kind of thing we want in the international world, where the central fact of our existence is that we and our system are challenged.

We are challenged by a doctrine that holds us to appeal to and act under all of those things most selfish in man. The Communists say: "You people boast that you say what you please, you think what you please, you worship as you please, you earn as you please." And they say they appeal to all that is idealistic in man; appeal to him and say: "Forget yourself, build up the state."

But to do that, the Communists have to make the state not only the ruler; they have to substitute for our convictions as to an Almighty--as to religious faith--they have to substitute likewise that state organism. That we flatly reject.

In any event, that communistic international dictatorship is seeking to destroy our way of life. If we then will apply among our friends in the world--the independent nations--the same principles in thinking, in cooperation, respect for common values, and in trade, in commerce, that we have among ourselves, we are as certain of defeating communism as we are that we are all in this hall this moment.

My friends, an enlightened trade policy in the international world for the United States means only this: we are trying to build a bridge, a permanent bridge, that will connect a growing and widely-shared prosperity at home with international peace. And that's all there is to it.

We hope to do this intelligently and wisely. But here and there we are going to uncover some dislocations in our economic development and in the economic developments of others, and we must make some concessions. And some of them--for people here and there--will be a bit painful. But if we keep in sight that underlying aspiration of all America--to continue to grow under the blessings of Almighty God with the tremendous opportunities that have been ours because of individual liberty--as long as we cooperate together for the common good, we cannot lose; we simply cannot lose. And we will soon adjust all local or painful experiences of the moment into a greater benefit for all, including those temporarily inconvenienced.

So I say: as this country was born in the self-sacrifice of its patriots, in their determination to work together, in their respect for one another--if we apply those principles today to ourselves at home, and to our tackling of our relationships with our friends abroad, we can dispel fear from our minds, and we can, as we achieve success, lead happy and full lives in perfect serenity and security.

I feel that the aspiration for global peace based on justice and on decency and respect for others means that we must continue to prosper at home, and those two goals are worthy of the best efforts of any American.

I thank you again for the honor of your asking me here. It has been a great pleasure to see you all. Good morning.

(87) Remarks at Presentation to Field Marshal Pibulsonggram of Thailand of the Legion of Merit, Degree of Chief Commander May 2, 1955 [The President spoke in the Rose Garden.]

EL-DI6-32 (IR)

CITATION TO ACCOMPANY THE AWARD OF

THE LEGION OF MERIT

(DEGREE OF CHIEF COMMANDER)

TO

FIELD MARSHAL P. PIBULSONGGRAM

ROYAL THAI ARMY

For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services to the United Nations and to the cause of freedom as Prime Minister and Minister of Defense, Kingdom of Thailand. Following the outbreak of hostilities in Korea on 26 June 1950, military forces from the Kingdom of Thailand were among the first to respond to the call of the United Nations to meet the challenge of enemy aggressor forces with armed resistance. With the approval of his Council of Ministers, Field Marshal Pibulsonggram directed the organization, training and equipping of a regimental combat team in Thailand, establishing a forward headquarters in Korea. Immediately upon their attainment of operational readiness he placed an infantry battalion, two frigates, an air force transportation detachment, and a Red Cross medical unit at the disposal of the Commander in Chief, United Nations Command, to support active military operations. Throughout the uncertain months which followed, he worked untiringly to further the spirit of cooperation within the United Nations' first great international fighting force. A resourceful and inspiring leader, he was instrumental in expanding the activities of the Joint United States Military Advisory Group to Thailand to include continuing training programs, thereby insuring the maximum mobility and combat effectiveness of the Royal Thai Armed Forces. By his outstanding professional skill, sound judgment and keen foresight, Field Marshal Pibulsonggram contributed significantly to the missions and objectives of the United Nations Command, reflecting the highest credit upon himself and the Royal Thai Armed Forces.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

Your Excellency, it is a great privilege for me to present to you the highest award that this Government can give to anyone not a citizen of this country.

It is a special privilege, because in this way we can take note, we hope, of the cooperation of one who has done so much to stand by our side as all of us attempt to defend human freedom, dignity, and liberty in the world.

My earnest compliments to you, sir.

NOTE: Field Marshal Pibulsonggram's response follows:

I am very grateful to you, sir, that when I arrived in your great country, everywhere I received a very cordial welcome--a treasured welcome. And this morning I had the occasion to have an audience with you, Mr. President, and now I receive this decoration from Your Excellency. I feel very honored. I try as forcibly as I can to lead my country to secure peace in the world. They will be always at your side in any way--to create the peace of the world.

(88) Remarks at the Governors' Conference Dinner May 2, 1955

[The President spoke at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, DC. His opening words "Governor Kennon" referred to Robert P. Kennon, Governor of Louisiana.]

EL-Dl6-33 (I R)

Governor Kennon, ladies and gentlemen:

It scarcely seems a year since at least a number of you and I were privileged to meet over at the White House. I assure you that I truly appreciate the invitation that Governor Kennon tells me is a return engagement of that party.

Washington is a great city of precedents, and you do something or you don't do something because Abraham Lincoln did it, or McKinley, or Grover Cleveland, or somebody else. I was very anxious to meet the Governors back in 1953 and they looked up the record, and I believe somewhere around 1908 and another time in 1925 all the Governors had been invited in.

Well, I wanted to see them, so I asked them in. The next year it seemed more necessary than ever to ask them back, and they came back. And then I was certainly astonished but still highly honored they should come back again.

I hope we have started a precedent, because there are a number of things wrong with Washington. One of them is, I think, almost everybody here has been too long away from home. But the duties of an official here being what they are, it is very difficult indeed for him to keep in touch with the people who bear comparable responsibilities back home. And so it is probably a very salutary experience for the people in Washington for the Governors to come in; they being so perfectly aware of the affairs in their own States they report what is going on, talk and think over and tell us something of their convictions, their opinions, the facts as they know them, in any State from Maine to California.

Now Governor Kennon said that you people came in to be oriented. As far as I am concerned, that is a very secondary purpose--possibly even less. This meeting is to bring us back closer to the people of your States.

I cannot imagine a body of greater dignity anywhere than the assembled body of Governors. Our forefathers readily understood the need for diffusing power, and they diffused it not only functionally but geographically. And if ever we lose that part of the system they set up, we will lose the United States as we know it.

The assembled body of Governors is, without official power, still one of the most important bodies that I could possibly imagine. And certainly I am honored to meet with them, and I hope that you, like myself, can say "I have profited" by each of your meetings here.

Now, it doesn't particularly bother me whether or not all of you agree with me. In fact, I have heard something more than rumors, I should say, that two or three of you, at least, disagree violently with most of the things in which I believe. And I should say this: they are just as welcome as anybody else, because America is a place of differing convictions, and if anyone wants to sit in an ivory tower and hear only from those people who believe with him, again,

America will not be what he would hope it would be.

Honest sharpening of our wits in dealing with honest men, differing with them, and thrashing out of troubles is the best assurance that our country will stay in the pattern that was laid out for us 178 years ago.

And I should say that the only requisite other than that we be honest is that we try to be informed, and that is not always easy. We know the world is complex. We know that our own daily, local lives become more complex in everything from distributing of a vaccine to the handling of problems dealing with Iran or Formosa or China, or anything else.

All along the line, different factors come to bear, the problems become very complex and no clean-cut simple answer is obtainable. But as we do meet with as much energy as each of us can marshal and we meet in all honesty, we are certain that the great composite opinions and convictions of this country, as represented unofficially in a body of Governors, will be a decision that will see America through any crisis.

So that you can understand how proud I am that the Governors have for three straight years met here in executive, off-the-record sessions, doing their best to give us the facts from their own particular areas--their convictions--their opinions.

I am not going to take up any of your time, or burden you this evening with any of the problems now bothering me. This is scarcely an occasion to turn into one of your executive or business sessions. I do want to assure you that I am honored to be your guest. I want to present to you Mrs. Eisenhower's deep regret that she couldn't come, but she does have a doctor who has ordered her to take it easy for a while. She asked me especially to say to all of the ladies of this group that she is deeply sorry that she couldn't be with you. Among you, of course, are many of her old friends as well as mine. She would love to have greeted you.

When I got here I was told I didn't have to talk at all. When I said, well, if I did, what shall I talk about, he said about a minute. I have exceeded my time. Ladies and gentlemen, good night, good luck, and I hope to see you again.

(90) President's Press Conference May 4, 1955 [President Eisenhower's sixty-seventh news conference was held in the Executive Office Building from 10:58 to 11:32am, in attendance: 188.]

EL-Dl6-67 (PC)

[This is a complete transcript of the news conference of this date. All of the President's replies were released for broadcasting or direct quotation at that time.]

THE PRESIDENT. Please be seated.

Good morning. Ladies and gentlemen, before we start the questioning this morning, I want to talk a little bit about a subject close to all our hearts; that is Dr. Salk's vaccine.

It is a very emotional subject because we are dealing with human lives, the lives of children of tender age; therefore, I think it is very incumbent upon all of us to proceed very carefully.

We should neither make the problem look too easy, and we shouldn't try to do anything here except to get out the facts and give people the very finest understanding that it is possible to give.

First of all, it has been assumed, I think, too often, that the entire problem is one of distribution; this is not true.

I have talked in one or two instances directly to scientists themselves--the question of safety--we must be absolutely sure that we are doing something that is safe and good.

One of the questions that comes up is the methods of actual testing of this vaccine. If you may test it in one way it can be done in a relatively short time. As quickly as you go to a system that may be more accurate, you run into a group of new technical problems that might delay the production of this vaccine for a good many weeks.

There has been suspected on the part of the scientists a reaction or a development that you might call the provocative effect of this vaccine.

You or I or a little child, which would be important, might have latent polio virus in his system, and in normal cases might pass through this period with no serious effects. He would have a few slight symptoms, but it would amount to nothing more.

Now, the actual puncture of the skin to give this shot might-they have not proved this, but it is just possible that it might cause some trouble.

All of these things are being studied by our scientists daily, almost on a 24-hour basis, and with all of the scientists we can mobilize to it to make certain as we proceed that the one thing that we must be careful of is that saving lives on a wholesale basis is achieved.

Now, the first great quantities of this material to come out of our laboratories have been purchased in advance by the national poliomyelitis society, and that is being distributed free to our children of the first and second grades.

They contracted for this material before it was known that it could really be produced. But in order to encourage the laboratories, the scientists, to go ahead with this system so that we would have it available this summer, the Foundation did so, and is making it available free. It is being distributed according to the plan that they laid out, a plan approved by the national advisory commission that Mrs. Hobby has collected.

Now, one thing has been the determination of the Government from the start, as far as its part of it is concerned, there will never be a child in the United States denied this emergency protection for want of ability to pay. Of that we are absolutely certain, and no difficulty along that line is anticipated.

In the distribution of this material, you have to deal with the amounts that are to become available as quick as the amounts taken off by the national society have been supplied.

There have been constant meetings, and the plan or the organization procedure is something of this sort: first, the national advisory committee decides upon the allocation, and the allocation, in general, is to each State according to its number of youngsters from 5 to 9. That is the basis for distributing these amounts until that day comes when it is plentiful and anybody can have it

anywhere, as long as there is a priority to be observed.

Then, they also get the agreement and have gotten the agreement of each of our producing companies that this will be shipped to the States in exact accordance with the ratio thus decided upon.

The State then informs the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare as to the places they want this shipped in order to get this vaccine used. And they name the hospitals or the schools or whatever are the public facilities they have for getting the injections accomplished.

These are sent to the producing companies who make the shipments. The reports then again come back to the Secretary, so that we know that the actual amounts allocated by this whole system have been shipped out, and are available in the State. And there is where the State picks up the authority for the actual giving of the vaccine to the children of the State.

Now, that is a rough approximation. Let me see if I have looked over any--the matter has already been discussed with the Governors of the States by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. And the Secretary is giving me a report which I may get this week covering every single detail, factual and planning detail, of the whole matter. As quickly as I get it, I will make it available to the public. You people will have it as soon as I can get hold of it.

Now, I think that covers the situation. I want to emphasize again that the matter of inability to pay is never going to have the slightest thing to do with this, and that it is going to be distributed equitably to every State in the Union, according to the standards set up by this advisory committee.

Q. Robert E. Clark, International News Service: Mr. President, are you giving any active consideration at this time to compulsory Federal controls on distribution?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, yes. I have given all sorts of consideration to it. As a matter of fact, I can't tell you the number of conferences. We believe that the system we have just laid out is the very best plan for getting this to the children in the quickest possible time and on the most equitable basis, because, in the long run, the States must enter this problem in some way or other. There is no other way to devise the machinery.

Q. Kenneth M. Scheibel, Gannett Newspapers: Mr. President, do you have any evidence that there is racketeering going on in the distribution of this vaccine?

THE PRESIDENT. No. There was a--it is a rather laborious explanation. At one time apparently our producing companies thought that methods for producing and testing were all in hand; it was all ready. Over and above what they were preparing for their original contract with the society, they were preparing a small amount for commercial distribution. Some of that, and a very small amount apparently, got out. There was no black marketing about it at all. It was a legitimate transaction, and here and there a few people, not of the groups I have described, the youngsters I have described, got it; but that was apparently something of a very transitory character.

Q. Walter Kerr, New York Herald Tribune: Mr. President, granted that it is a legitimate operation, do you care to comment on the propriety of that distribution while the vaccine is in short supply?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I don't want to comment without knowing somewhat more of the facts than I do. But I do say this: apparently they thought they had the problem all solved. This was going along swimmingly, everybody was going to have all they wanted, and they were getting into the commercial field. I am not going to comment on it at the moment because that is all I know. The report of Mrs. Hobby may bring up that particular point.

Q. Martin S. Hayden, Detroit News: Mr. President, in describing this process you mentioned it goes to the States for hospitals, schools, and so forth. Is there anywhere in this process a point at which a private doctor can get it for distribution to children in this level?

THE PRESIDENT. I am certain the States will have to do it through private doctors. If we don't use all of the 100,000-and-some private doctors in this country, I don't see how this could be done. But I mean the States themselves will have to establish the systems under which the private doctors do this service for the children.

Q. Mr. Hayden: In other words, sir, you would assume that in addition to the children who get it free under planned programs, that other children in that age group whose parents are willing and able to pay will be able to?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, now, let's don't go too fast. This is one of these cases where you had better be safe than sorry. All of the vaccine now coming out has already been contracted for. We are talking about the vaccine that is going to come out as long as there is a shortage. People within these critical age groups need, I believe it is, the first two shots, because I believe the booster shot doesn't come along until 7 months later. Now we are talking about that time. If the States want to handle it entirely, let us say, through a medical association, it would sound to me all right. But the State will have the responsibility that the amount allocated to it under this formula is used properly to serve the interests of that State.

Q. Martin Agronsky, American Broadcasting Company: Mr. President, I don't want to get you into an area, sir, in which you may not be expert. But I would like to go into some of the medical points that you made. You said that if this injection were given, and the person who got it had latent poliomyelitis germs, that there was a possibility, according to the doctors, that they might develop a case of poliomyelitis. Now, under those circumstances, sir, considering the experiences out in California, out West, is it still considered wise by the doctors to go ahead on a national scale?

THE PRESIDENT. You mean now?

Q. Mr. Agronsky: Yes, sir.

THE PRESIDENT. In a general case, yes. Now, they are checking up on a number of things. For example, in the time of highest incidence, when apparently these germs are everywhere, each of us may have some of them. It may be that they will decide there is a certain period of this year when they shouldn't give this at all. Remember this: never has there been such a rush job as this done, and scientists are watching it day and night. I think I can comment no further on the strictly medical possibilities. But they are going ahead with the distribution under the present system.

Q. Mr. Agronsky: They consider it safe and wise still to do it

THE PRESIDENT. That is right. Under those amounts and, I think there is one company that has not yet been cleared.

Q. Frank van der Linden, Nashville Banner: Mr. President, just to change the subject a little bit, the Governors of Tennessee and Kentucky spoke for about an hour yesterday with your general counsel and with Labor Secretary Mitchell, asking for some help to settle these telephone and railroad strikes. I wonder what the administration is doing to settle those two strikes?

THE PRESIDENT. Of course, we have set up a Mediation and Conciliation Service for settling of strikes. The law does not intend that the executive department, as such, intervene except only in the case where national emergencies occur. Now, from the beginning of this strike I have been kept in almost daily touch with the Secretary of Agriculture [Labor]. He has kept in touch with the Mediation Service, and in some cases with the principals. I understand that these parties in this strike have come very, very close together, and the prospects for settlement are bright indeed. And I know these two Governors talked yesterday with the Secretary; I had a report on it this morning.I am told I said "Secretary of Agriculture." I meant Secretary of Labor, I am sorry.

Q. Robert W. Richards, The Copley Press: The Governors of Illinois and Wisconsin said that an overwhelming majority of the Governors attending the conference in the last 2 days favor your highway program over the Gore bill. Can you comment on that, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. As you will recall, last year I couldn't attend the Governors' Conference up in New York. Vice President Nixon delivered my message, in which I asked the Governors' Conference to establish a transportation road committee and to work with the committee I would set up, and we would devise a program. Now, the program that that committee of Governors set up for building the highways of this country is almost identical with the plan brought up by the Clay committee. And so it is what I stand behind. So far as I know, there never has been any rescission of the Governors' action, of their approval at that time.

Q. Nat S. Finney, Buffalo News: Mr. President, some new agricultural legislation is pending on the Hill, and I wonder if you could refresh us as to your views on that farm problem generally, and the legislation.

THE PRESIDENT. I am delighted to do so. [Laughter] Last year we finally had passed a farm bill. It is good legislation. But it has not yet had an opportunity to be in effect. It will not go into effect until the crops of the 1955 year begin to come to market. So all of the farm squeeze which has taken place, and it has taken place, has been under the old law, the 90-percent rigid parity price supports. Now, the law that we have is designed to bring production and consumption as nearly into line as we possibly can. It was passed with bipartisan support. And right now Senator Eastland, I noticed--I think it was yesterday or the day before-made a talk in which he said one of the contributory causes, the difficulties, in the cotton industry is the old price law, 90 percent rigid. Senator Ellender so much feels this way that he says he is not even going to hold hearings in the Senate on this new proposal. This plan that was devised last year should have its full opportunity to work and see whether we can't bring about a better prosperity in the farm area that will really be permanent and sound economically.

Q. Irene Albert, Clearwater Sun: Mr. President, I wanted to ask one more thing about the Salk vaccine. In Florida we have a high polio incidence, and the parents there are much disturbed for

fear there will not be sufficient polio vaccine to inoculate the children in the 5-to-9 age group.

THE PRESIDENT. I have been assured that even with this one company out, there is still enough to reach all the 5-to-9 group before August first.

Q. Miss Albert: Before the heavy polio season sets in for the summer?

THE PRESIDENT. That is right. Q. Miss Albert: Thank you, sir.

Q. Donald H. Shannon, Los Angeles Times: Secretary of the Air Force Talbott last week told reporters that you knew about his opposition to further expansion of the aircraft industry in southern California, and that you were all for it, were the words he used. Mr. Talbott's policy has caused alarm in California and in Congress here, and it is on the ground that the aircraft industry is being singled out for dispersal, although no such policy is being applied to other industries. Would you comment on it, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, this is the first time I have heard this charge, because for the past 2 ½ years, I think, almost every time the subject of dispersal has come up, it has been dealt with on a generalized basis. Everybody that I know of in the administration, and particularly the head of the office of ODM who is principally concerned, is in favor of dispersal of industry of all kinds. This is the first time I have heard that the Air Forces would be particularly singled out.

Q. Lloyd M. Schwartz, Fairchild Publications: Mr. President, there seems to be some confusion in the Senate Labor Committee as to whether you agree with Secretary of Labor Mitchell that the Fair Labor Standards Act ought to be extended to cover employees of interstate retail chains. I wonder whether you could say whether you share this opinion?

THE PRESIDENT. Of what law?

Q. Mr. Schwartz: It is the wage-hour law. He suggested that it cover interstate retail chain employees.

THE PRESIDENT. I am not going to try to answer that in the detail in which you have asked it, because I don't know that much about it. I do believe, and I have been through study and through conferences with Secretary Mitchell, that there are areas to which a minimum wage should be extended, where the people are not covered now and they should be. Now, I am not going to try to pin it down as you did.

Q. Garnett D. Homer, Washington Star: Mr. President, Senate and House conferees have agreed on a compromise postal pay raise bill which calls for an average raise of 8.8 percent. There have been predictions that you would veto such a bill. Can you tell us what your reaction is?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, there may have been predictions, but you remember I have never predicted it. In just a few days I will have to study that very carefully, and my answer will be apparent at that time.

Q. Charles S. von Fremd, CBS News: I hesitate to ask this question, sir, because it is a very personal one, and I hope it will not offend you, and that you realize I ask it only because of the nature of the position you hold in the world today. It was brought up some weeks ago by the Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, who said he did not think you would seek

reelection, and gave as one of the primary reasons the health of your wife. And over the weekend Dr. Snyder indicated that, unfortunately, Mrs. Eisenhower has not completely recovered from her recent illness. And I wonder, sir, at the risk of intruding into your private personal life, if you could comment on this to enlighten us a bit in this matter.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think it is a legitimate question. With respect to anybody else's comment about such things, I haven't a word to say. With respect to Mrs. Eisenhower's health, I would say that her general health for the past 2 years has probably been better than normal, if we go back for a period of the last 10 years. She did have a very serious virus infection a good many weeks ago, and it seemed impossible for her to throw it off. She also has an allergy to some of these drugs that some of the rest of us can take without any great difficulty, and it has been a real problem for the doctors to bring her back to her accustomed state of health. Now, that is the situation. She is, of course, not as robust and strong as some people, but she is a good healthy person, I think, in the general meaning of that word.She has had--this spring--difficulty which, unfortunately, a number of my other friends have had, too.

Q. Alan S. Emory, Watertown Times: Sir, the Republican National Committee late last week put out a publication and a covering press release which said that corollary evidence showed that Governor Harriman of New York, who, at the time, was our Ambassador to Moscow, was the real architect of the Yalta agreement. Does the information that has reached you through military, public, and private channels tend to substantiate that remark?

THE PRESIDENT. I never heard of that remark. Of course, I knew nothing about the Yalta agreements; it would be futile for me to attempt to comment. I was never asked during the war to give my opinion on a single postwar prospect of a political character, never; so I know nothing at all about this matter.

Q. Sarah McClendon, El Paso Times: Sir, of course you know that many farmers, small farmers, are having a very hard time now because of their limiting cotton acreage allotments--

THE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Q. Mrs. McClendon:--and there is some concern been expressed by civic leaders and even ministers in some parts of Texas that these small farmers are being urged now by some subordinate officials of the Department of Agriculture to sell out to large landowners. What do you think about Government officials urging hard-pressed small farmers to sell out to big dealers?

THE PRESIDENT. Well again, of course, I have never heard of such a thing. Frankly, I don't believe it. I don't believe that governmental officials--unless someone who thought they were on a friendly basis might say, "Well, you are not doing too well here, why don't you sell out?" And you might say that to me or I might say that to you--[laughter]--but I wouldn't.

Q. Mrs. McClendon: Sir, I wouldn't dare.

THE. PRESIDENT. I wouldn't necessarily assume that is the official position of your newspaper because you said it. [Laughter]

Q. Marvin L. Arrowsmith, Associated Press: Mr. President, has there been any progress toward

arranging any kind of negotiations with the Chinese Communists on a cease-fire since we talked to you last week?

THE PRESIDENT. No. As a matter of fact, as far as this country is concerned, we are sort of in a wait-and-see attitude. There are, as you know, a number of countries that are interesting themselves in this, and conducting explorations. But there is really nothing new to report.

Q. Joseph R. Slevin, New York Journal of Commerce: Mr. President, with respect to the farm legislation, do you anticipate that the decline in farm prices and farm income will stop as the administration's flexible support program is allowed to become effective?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think it will eventually. As I have insisted from the beginning, the farm program is like so many other things. You get into a great trend in this country-we piled up these billions of dollars' worth of surpluses--you can't cure that in a minute. There are all sorts of laws and pieces of laws that will help to reduce these surpluses and get things back on a better balance between supply and demand. But as of now, you couldn't pass any law that just suddenly would turn this around.

Q. John M. Hightower, Associated Press: Have you considered, sir, setting up a United States military base on Formosa?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, you know we have a MAAG and things of that kind there now. There are small elements of American forces there. But there has been no suggestion made that we would put in a big major base on Formosa.

Q. Robert J. Donovan, New York Herald Tribune: Sir, coming back to the Salk polio for a moment, under this system that you have outlined for distribution allocation to the States, how can you be sure, sir, that the polio in that system--that the vaccine will reach the schoolchildren as it is intended? And what will be done if it did not?

THE PRESIDENT. Of course, I am going to assume that States are responsive to the needs of their people. I am going to assume that they will follow the technical advice just exactly as this administration would. If they are going to give it to others, I would think that the people of that State would make short shrift of that kind of a decision. Now, as quickly as you say the Federal Government will pass a law, and that down in a certain State such and such a person will do so-and-so, or do such-and-such to another person, you get into constitutional questions of the gravest kind. What we are assuming that this country does want is to eliminate polio as rapidly as possible among its children. And I think we have got a right to assume that.

Q. Laurence H. Burd, Chicago Tribune: Mr. President, have you had any additional communication with Marshal Zhukov since our last meeting?

THE PRESIDENT. No.

Q. Mr. Burd: Is there anything more you can tell us since our last meeting?

THE PRESIDENT. No, none.

Q. William H. Lawrence, New York Times: Mr. President, the military manpower reserve program is coming up in the House either today or tomorrow, and I was wondering, sir, whether

events in the last few months have caused you to increase or lessen your own desire for such a program?

THE PRESIDENT. Mr. Lawrence, I have been working for a proper reserve program for the United States certainly since 1929, and I am not going to stop now. Now we are making progress at last. There seems to be a widening understanding of the need for this kind of thing. And it looks to me like the bill that is now coming out shows that we are really making progress. I applaud it.

Q. Edward P. Morgan, American Broadcasting Company: Mr. President, you have issued an order rather strictly restricting conditions under which congressional committees can get income tax returns. Can you tell us why this was done and whether it was to cover some specific situation?

THE PRESIDENT. No. It is a matter of the most delicate character. But the orders that I issued were completely coordinated with the chairmen of the committees that were affected by the order.[1] And so far as I know, they are completely satisfied with them.

[1]The White House indicated after the news conference was completed that the coordination had been effected specifically with Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, Senate Majority Leader, Senator Harry F. Byrd, Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, Representative Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House, and Representative Jere Cooper, Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Q. Donald J. Gonzales, United Press: Mr. President, has consideration been given to the placing of some additional ground forces, as such, on Formosa, even though we aren't going to put in a big base?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I have thought of everything out there that might be needed. But to make it a permanent station for American ground forces, I have not had such a recommendation from anybody yet.

Q. Charles E. Shutt, Telenews: Mr. President, Western Germany is about to become a member of the free nations, sovereign nations, once again. Would you comment on that, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, of course, it is something for which this Government has been working for a long, long time. We are delighted, and we hope that it goes forward smoothly and without a hitch. Above all, we do hope that this development will bring about an elimination at long last of some of the principal causes of one of the most tragic things that has afflicted Europe for a long time; that is, that apparently implacable mutual hostility between the French and the Germans. I believe that with removal of some of the causes for that friction, Europe will be on a new era of prosperity and security.

Q. Elie Abel, New York Times: We have been told time and again, sir, that in the event of an attack on the coastal islands of Quemoy and the Matsus, that you would make the decision about whether we resisted--the United States, that is. Now, could you tell us, sir, could you discuss, rather, the criteria that could be applied to distinguish a local attack on those islands from one that appeared to be a preliminary to an attack on Formosa?

THE PRESIDENT. Really you are asking for a staff study. But if there were accumulated in that area, and the attack were started with, material that would seem to be far in excess in its types

and kind of what was needed to take the islands, why, you would be justified, I think, in assuming it had a broader purpose. Moreover, I should like to point out that in all of the statements made by the Red Chinese never have they talked about their purpose of capturing the offshore islands. They have said, "We are going to capture Formosa."

Q. Chalmers M. Roberts, Washington Post and Times Herald: Mr. President, last week you startled some of us with your precision reference to 21 more months. Are we to infer, sir, that you have a calendar on the White House wall that you are checking off? [Laughter]

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I am aware of what month it is, at least; I am still aware of that. [Laughter]

Q. Samuel S. Wilson, Cincinnati Times-Star: Mr. President, my question concerns your nomination of John Hollister as your new foreign aid chief.

THE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Q. Mr. Wilson: Could you tell us whether you have had any assurances from Mr. Hollister that he favors the administration's foreign aid program?

THE PRESIDENT. Did I have what?

Q. Mr. Wilson: Did you have any assurances from Mr. Hollister that he favors the administration's foreign aid program?

THE PRESIDENT. No--that is personally, no.

Q. William M. Blair, New York Times: Mr. President, aside from the economics involved in the farm debate on the Hill at the present time, the supporters of the administration program are charging that this. is a political maneuver. Do you agree that it is a political rather than an economic maneuver?

THE PRESIDENT. I think that you people probably know those individuals and some of that maneuvering as well as I do. I will let you make your own deductions.

Q. A. E. Salpeter, Haaretz (Tel Aviv): There have been reports that the administration this year intends to ask Congress for a global sum of military aid instead of undertaking in advance the specific sums to be allocated to each country. Is this report correct? And if, yes, could you explain the reason for it?

THE PRESIDENT. The program itself will be before the Congress in--I thought it was before there now--soon, anyway, and that will explain it. Never do you ask merely for a global sum. Of course you have to explain to Congress what you are doing it for. Now, there has always been retained also in these programs a certain flexibility, left to the discretion of the President in order to meet emergencies. But, in general, the sums for each country are laid out in the bill.

Q. Francis M. Stephenson, New York Daily News: Mr. President, I would like to ask two questions. One is on your plans on dealing with the Hoover Commission reports and recommendations, and I also would like to ask the status of the transportation report.

THE PRESIDENT. Yes. On the Hoover Commission report, it comes to our attention, you see, in segments. And as each segment comes up, why, it is studied and either something is done about it at the moment or it may be referred to Congress, because it has to go to Congress, as you know. There is no set procedure where a special committee is set up to handle that. It affects the several departments, and they make their recommendations to me. The transportation report is a brilliant piece of work in its analysis of our difficulties and in the purposes it announces that it wants to achieve. It was seven, I believe, seven Cabinet officers before whom appeared the transportation experts of the United States. The purpose, of course, is to make competitive influences more governing in our whole transportation system. It looks forward to that kind of a result. The person to remember, of course, here, is the general consuming public. They are the people who use the transportation, both the personnel transportation and the freight. There are details of that report1 that will be most argumentative, and will give rise to, I think, a very lot of discussion, probably heated discussion. And it should be so. But I think the basic principles are commendable; certainly I approve of them and the purposes they announce.

John L. Cutter, United Press: Thank you, Mr. President.

[1]On April 18, the report prepared by the Presidential Advisory Committee on Transport Policy and Organization (15 pages, mimeographed) was released by the White House. The report includes recommendations on (1) a national transportation policy; (2) increased reliance on competitive forces in rate making; (3) the maintenance of a modernized and financially strong system of common carrier transportation. In addition the Committee made recommendations concerning the special problem of Government rates. Members of the Advisory Committee included the Secretary of Commerce, Chairman; the Secretary of Defense, and the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. Ad hoc participating members were: the Secretary of the Treasury, the Postmaster General, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

***Remarks at the Congressional Women's Club May 5, 1955**

EL-Dl6-33 (IR)

(92) Remarks at the Dedication of the Washington Hebrew Congregation Temple May 6, 1955

EL-Dl6-33 (IR)

Ladies and gentlemen:

A few moments ago, before this service began, I was privileged to meet some of the distinguished members of this congregation in the library. Several of them voiced a word of amazement that the President of the United States should attend a service of a faith not his own and, in spite of other preoccupations, come both to the religious service and to the dedication of this great Temple.

I personally think that this is natural. There is nothing unique or particularly extraordinary about it. This country is a spiritual organism. Let us go back for a moment to its founding. The men who led the revolution against England well understood that they were fighting for spiritual values.

Do you recall such words as "Taxation without representation is tyranny"? They did not say taxation was wrong. Indeed, they knew its need--possibly as well as we do. But without representation, without being a part of the authority that levies those taxes, it became tyranny. "I

know not what others may do," said Patrick Henry, "but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

Liberty--a spiritual value. They claimed these. They fought for them. They died for them. And they gave us this nation.

Now, wherein was their claim for these rights, these spiritual rights of man? You find them in the Declaration of Independence. "We hold that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights," said they.

These rights, then, come not because we have emigrated to this great and glorious land, crowded with God's resources, not because we have been more fortunate than our brethren elsewhere, but because each is a child of God. And any true American must recognize in another American those fights endowed by God, because if we don't, we are not true to the concepts of the men who wrote the Declaration of Independence.

Consequently, today the President of the United States, the official head of the country, is after all the official head of a great nation that is religious in its background and has a spiritual foundation on which to stand. Therefore, it is entirely fitting and in keeping with his Office that he should come to such a great and significant event in the lives of one part of the great faiths that have made this country what it is, to pay his respects to that faith, and to this event and to the people who have made it possible.

This building--a house of worship--will bring to many thousands in the future and through the years a renewed appreciation of the fact that they do have the rights that this country confers upon them, because that country was born and has existed in the knowledge that God is the source of all power.

If this great Temple continues to serve in that way, if its officials--its rabbis--continue to bring home to the hearts of all people who here come to worship that we owe all in the end to the Almighty and not merely to the good fortune of our birth, then it will indeed have served a noble purpose and one that we may all salute with great joy--with great satisfaction.

One more word about the rights that we enjoy. It is not enough to know that God gave those rights to you and to your neighbor. It is well to remember this also: you may not protect those rights only for yourself. You must protect them for all, or your own will be lost.

The Boston Tea Party took place, of course, in the Boston Harbor, and Massachusetts was the scene of the first outbreak of our Revolutionary War. But had not the other Colonies recognized that if Massachusetts went under, they also went under; that if the rights of Massachusetts and her citizens could be destroyed and trampled under foot, theirs also would suffer a like fate, then there would have been no successful war and no eventual United States.

And so I say I come here in great pride in the capacity of official head--temporarily--of this country, to pay my respects to all who have built it, to all the good that shall come out of it, and to offer my felicitations to each member of this congregation who will have such an inspiring place hereafter to come for their worship.

So my little part in the dedication of this Temple is merely to say it is a most gratifying thing to

me, both personally and officially, that it is a completed building.

Thank you.

NOTE: The Washington Hebrew Congregation is the oldest institution for Hebrew worship in the Nation's Capital. Its charter was signed by President Franklin Pierce.

(93) Remarks to the Delegates to the General Assembly of the Organization of World Touring and Automobile Clubs May 10, 1955 [The President spoke in the Rose Garden at 11am.]

EL-Dl6-33 (IR)

IT IS indeed a pleasure, ladies and gentlemen, to invite you here to the White House grounds and give me an opportunity to say a word to you. If there is one enthusiastic booster for international travel in the world, I would certainly be numbered among those who come close to the top. Having traveled a bit myself, I am quite certain that it is a very, very useful thing, in bringing to each of us an understanding of those things we need to know in the world, if we are going to achieve any progress whatsoever toward this great goal of peace.

In this country, for one reason or another, we have, possibly, been more backward in the building of roads we need than we should have been. We have a plan that is now before our legislative body to develop the kind of roads that will make it most convenient for you people to come over and visit all parts of this great country very easily, and we would hope with a great deal of increased convenience over what you would now experience.

But on top of that, we are interested in getting the entire Pan American Highway completed so that travel north and south is easier. We like to see roads springing up everywhere because we are certain that as you people from all countries come to visit us, and we come to meet you, there is going to be nothing but good come out of it.

Just as people are afraid of the dark, they are afraid of people they don't know--they think they must be strange creatures. But as they get to know each other, we see that they respond to the same kind of impulses, the same kind of needs and admiration, and respect the same kind of values. So that is the sort of thing that must underlie this search for peace.

I think you people are doing not only a useful but an indispensable part of the task in bringing it about. I realize that these representatives here really represent some 20 million people, and I am told there are 31 countries here represented, which makes it a truly significant body, one that is certain to carry back when you go back to your own homes much of value from your associations here together, in the exchange of ideas. For my part I wish you every kind of good luck and success in the work you are doing. I can't tell you how I would really like to walk up and down Pennsylvania Avenue carrying a banner and cheering for you because I think you are on a job that needs to be done, and I know you will do it well. I thank you a lot for letting me have a chance to talk to you.

(94) Remarks at the Republican Women's National Conference May 10, 1955 [The President spoke at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, DC at 12 noon. His opening words "Miss Adkins" referred to Bertha Adkins, Assistant to the Chairman of the Republican

National Committee.]

EL-DI6-34 (IR)

Miss Adkins and ladies:

I realize there have been a number of speakers in front of you this morning, and there possibly may be some question in your minds as to what I could add to the information already given you.

Not long ago I was at one of Miss Adkins' breakfasts for ladies. It is her custom to have each one of these Republican ladies present whatever ideas are in their minds. Finally it happened that before it got around to the very last lady and my turn, that the last lady on deck was a Negro lady. She felt a little bit in the position that I do now: most of the things had been said. But she looked these people in the eye, and she said, "Well, since each of the prior speakers have referred to this most auspicious and enjoyable occasion, you must admit that I add to this most auspicious occasion, a touch of color!" Well, I tell you, she took over the meeting--but I don't have her advantage.

But these people who have spoken this morning to you have given you a series of facts, plans, convictions that are the basis of the confidence and optimism that we feel today.

There is one generalization to make as we proceed in our thinking about the Republican Party as an agency for serving this great country and that is that the public must be an informed public, if a republic or a democracy is to be a success.

There are certain decisions that people--the people as a whole must make. If they are not informed, they cannot make those decisions intelligently. They will be hit and miss, and therefore only accident will make a decision a correct decision.

We must be informed. Consequently, these people, in trying to present to you the facts, are doing a service but no greater service than you yourselves are doing by gathering together and in meeting with these people of your government, informing yourselves, so that in turn you can carry these facts--these truths-back to the localities from which you came.

The twin objectives of this Administration are a widely shared increasing prosperity at home, and peace abroad.

I think you have heard much on both these subjects this morning. With prosperity at home we must not forget that prosperity can never be the product of a static organism. There must be a growth: there must be an expansion that keeps up with and even exceeds the expansion of our population as we achieve a new number of two-and-a-half to two-and-three-quarters of a million more people a year.

Among other things we need are road programs, health programs, all of those things give to our people the right to enjoy every kind of spiritual growth to which they aspire, to achieve new intellectual heights and to have a greater material standard of living.

If each of our citizens has a right and an opportunity to work for those three things--and to achieve them in some measure each year--then we are getting what we call a growing prosperity widely shared. And that means roads and schools and hospitals and factories, wide employment

and an increasing income for agriculture and the industrial worker--everybody. There is no class, no group, no individual that may be omitted and still have this objective achieved.

Now, peace abroad.

The central fact of our time, of course, is the implacable hostility of a doctrine which heads up into the group in the Kremlin which has announced its intention of conquering the world, believing in the overthrow of other forms of government by force, and substituting its own dictatorship of the proletariat for representative and free forms of government.

I shall not bore you with all of their claims about the weaknesses of capitalism and free democracies and free republics. We know that to be a fact.

In this struggle, they have one thing that is important. They have unity. It is the unity that is achieved by force--a knife in the back. People must conform or they are eliminated.

That is not the kind of unity we have, nor which we seek. But we do know we must have a unity among those nations that do not want to fall prey to this kind of existence--to fall prey to the spreading threat of communism. So we must have a community of interest that brings about the spontaneous unity that we want. That is, if we are to present a unified strength in the free world against a unified strength of the Communist world, there must be a great spiritual basis, an intellectual basis, a material basis, that leads people and nations to want to hold together and to oppose this evil.

That, my friends, is really the basis toward which we work in order to gain the strength that will oppose communism so firmly at every critical point in the world. Its progress will be stopped gradually as people everywhere become informed and understand the appeal that freedom has for the human soul as opposed to slavery. Then it will begin to atrophy--to dry up--and finally go the way of all dictatorships.

But to achieve that material, intellectual, and spiritual community of interests among the free world--the peoples of the free world--is a difficult task. It is one that engages your government, both branches--legislative and executive--all the time, every day.

We must make certain that people can make a living; that they can satisfy natural human wants; that they understand what they are working for; that they are to see a brighter day by working spontaneously with the free nations of the world as against this great communistic threat. That is the basis for all the things you hear called foreign aid--mutual security. Everything we do is to achieve the solidarity of partnership with our neighbors, recognizing their rights, recognizing their right to express their opinions and convictions and influence decisions as we move ahead. That will make that solidity of communion and partnership that can achieve success from a position of strength.

I think it entirely possible that Secretary Hoover has spoken to you some of the events of the past two years--those things that give reason to believe that we are somewhat on the upswing in this great, age-old effort of man.

Here I might pause just to say that always the United States has been a peace-loving nation. We have never wanted to fight wars. And in recognition of this fact, I thought it well, sometime

back, to appoint a man of national stature to a specific position, to look into all questions of disarmament--which means also the promotion of peace. There can be no true disarmament without peace, and there can be no real peace without very material disarmament.

And so Governor Stassen's position, to study and devise plans and ways of implementing them in this great field of disarmament, is in fact a sort of secretarial position for peace. We give one man in the Administration the job of thinking of this and doing nothing else. I believe that nothing else is symbolizing in this form the effort and purpose of the United States--it can be nothing but beneficial both at home and abroad.

As for myself and for the Secretary of State and others involved, including those in the Legislature, we stand ready to do anything, to meet with anyone, anywhere, as long as we may do so in self-respect, demanding the respect due this Nation, and there is any slightest idea or chance of furthering this great cause of peace. We will not stand on minor questions of protocol or any other inconsequential question, if that opportunity of advancing the cause of peace is presented and there is the slightest chance that it may bring for our children and those that come after us a better world in this respect.

So it is, then, that these facts have been presented before you this morning, before the backdrop of two great purposes--a widespread prosperity at home and peace abroad. We are pursuing them tirelessly and energetically. It is the methods and the implementation of these purposes that constitute the governmental facts that must be carried back to our people.

Personally, in such a problem, in such a purpose, I believe that women are better apostles than men. Men are engrossed in many kinds of activities. They earn the living. They are engaged in business all day, and they are very apt, at times, to lose that great rounded concept of man that women almost always have before them: that he is a spiritual, and intellectual, and a physical being. He is not merely someone trying to get a higher wage. He wants a higher wage for a purpose, to give greater opportunity in all three of these fields to his family. Because women think of these things in their process of homemaking, think of them in terms of children and the family, I believe that their influence in spreading the basic doctrines of this kind is more profound than that of men.

Consequently, it is always an honor to come before you and urge a group like this really to get at it and let us go.

Now certainly I would be remiss if I left this platform without talking for a moment about the word "Republican." I read in the papers that the Republicans are a minority party. Now I will venture one thing, that the people who believe as we do, who will follow along in the paths marked out by the two great objectives, in the programs of implementation that have been described to you by certain Cabinet officers and will be furthered in large measure later in your meetings--these people that want to do as we do are the vast majority of the American people. This means, my friends, that real evangelical work in the business of educating, of informing, will make the Republican Party the majority party, and keep it that way.

A very great early President of the United States said that if he was forced to choose government without schools or schools without government, he would unhesitatingly choose schools. He meant, of course, that if he had to have a government over an ignorant people, or an informed

people who would later find the necessity of having a government, he would of course take the informed people.

That is what we need to do now. We do not need to go out merely to exhort. We merely need to go out and show what the facts of this day and time are--what it is that the United States wants, what it is that the people of the world want. The people of the world want exactly what we do. They want opportunity and peace. They want security.

All right: let us go out and show that is exactly what the Republicans are bringing to the people, offering it in full measure richly and with everybody entitled to his share. No one can ask more than to do his share in bringing about such a great objective, such a great purpose.

Ladies and gentlemen, there are some gentlemen here--I thought I made a mistake there, for a moment--if I could make one simple request of you, it would be this: that as you go back, each to your own purposes and efforts in your own localities, it is not that we try to teach and preach Republicanism just because we worship the word. Let us go back to Republicanism and find the great purposes for which it stands, the great programs that have been brought forward by the consultation of people throughout this land--advisory bodies of citizens, governmental officials, professionals, everybody that could help. That great program is there to help achieve the purposes that we state. Then we can talk "Republicans" because almost everybody will be Republicans.

Thank you a lot.

(95) President's Press Conference May 11, 1955 [President Eisenhower's sixty-eighth news conference was held in the Executive Office Building from 10:33 to 11:02am, in attendance: 211.]

EL-Dl6-68 (PC)

[This is a complete transcript of the news conference of this date. Those portions of the President's replies which were not released for broadcasting or direct quotation at that time are enclosed in brackets.]

THE PRESIDENT. Please sit down. Only one short announcement this morning, ladies and gentlemen.

This morning I am going to have the opportunity to see Mr. McElroy, who is chairman of the White House Conference on Education that will meet this year. It is a conference to which I attach the greatest hopes. For the first time in history, as preliminary to that conference, every one of the 48 States and our Territories are having State or Territorial conferences on education. We will bring together their experiences, their ideas, and plans; and certainly the whole field of education should get a tremendous boost from the work of these people. The reason I mention it is because a little later in the morning I may have a formal statement to make after I meet with him. All right.

Q. Merriman Smith, United Press: Mr. President, could you tell us, sir, your preferences for time and place for a Big Four meeting? I ask this question against the background of rumors,

THE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Q. Mr. Smith:--or reports from Europe that this country favors a meeting in July in Switzerland.

THE PRESIDENT. Actually I have no preference except to the extent that I should like to see the meeting held, if held at all, in one of the so-called neutral countries. You must understand this whole idea is still in the exploratory stage. We have issued an invitation because of reasons that finally seemed to us to be cogent, and such a meeting would probably result in at least some clarification of the air. But our foreign ministers will now meet in Vienna in connection with the Austrian Treaty, presumably. They will decide whether the invitation is acceptable in its terms, its ideas, and then they will discuss such things as place and timing. As I have said often, I will go anywhere anytime if any good is to be done, and this earlier meeting ought to determine whether it seems useful.

Q. William H. Lawrence, New York Times: Could you tell us, sir, some of the reasons why you did change your mind about the feasibility and desirability of a summit conference now and in advance, so to speak, of a protracted foreign ministers' meeting?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, of course, this business of foreign affairs, things change from day to day. The mere fact that it appeared that the Austrian Treaty was to be signed did not in itself seem to me, as I think I told you in April some time, a reason for a meeting at the summit. But I said of course that situation can change rapidly. Now, there has been a growing sentiment discernible throughout the world that from a meeting like this something might come. There has been clear evidence presented through the press, through correspondence, through our contacts through diplomatic sources, that there is a vague feeling some good might come out of such a conference. When, then, to hold such a conference: just to put a stamp of approval on something that may have been done by foreign ministers? Or to try to stimulate thought, and possibly even to define the areas in which you would expect your foreign ministers to work so that something might be accomplished? Finally, I felt this: this business of trying to reach a clarification of issues, if such a thing is possible, is so important that you can't stand on any other principle except do your utmost as you preserve your own strength of position, as long as you are not sacrificing it, as long as you are not expecting too much. Don't be just. stubborn in your refusal to expect anything, but go ahead and see what you can find about it. Now, it does also do this: it gives a personal opportunity to sense an atmosphere in that circle. However, I think those vague, rather generalized reasons are really lying behind this. There is no expectation on my part that in a few hours, a few days, or a few weeks this world is going to be turned around. By no means, and I am not going, if I do go, under any such thought. But I would hope that my own mind will be clarified a little bit. Maybe the platform from which we may later work will be a little clearer even to ourselves.

Q. Charles E. Shutt, Telenews: There has been much speculation, sir, as to what might be discussed at this meeting. Would it be proper for you to tell us what you feel would be the most important topic that could be discussed?

THE PRESIDENT. I would think the most important thing that could possibly be done at such a meeting would be to define the lines or directions in which we commonly would want our foreign ministers to work to see whether there is any opportunity to relieve the tensions in the world. Beyond that, I don't even possibly say what the subject would be. Certainly there would

be no agenda except in the most generalized form, to talk about a general group of subjects; no agenda in the sense that foreign ministers would normally meet.

Q. Chalmers M. Roberts, Washington Post and Times Herald: Mr. President, to follow that question, do you have in mind the idea of working on specific matters, such as the German unification problem, or are you thinking now that it may be possible to have a larger framework of discussion, such as some general East-West settlement in Europe?

THE PRESIDENT. I don't think that either of your assumptions is quite correct as I now visualize it. I think that we merely, I repeat, could define the areas in which people would start to work. Now, when they start to work in any area, you find it affects every other area. I think there could be no limitation, and at the same time you couldn't possibly give an exact description of what you are going to do. You are going to meet, try to discover whether you believe the other people are sincerely hoping to relieve tensions. If so, what are the areas of greatest tension and what can these people do?

Q. Mr. Roberts: Sir, may I ask a further point. You spoke yesterday to the Republican Women about disarmament, for example.

THE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Q. Mr. Roberts: Would that be included in this type of discussion?

THE PRESIDENT. I wouldn't see any possibility, if you are going to relieve tensions, that you didn't have to discuss disarmament. But what I say is you would neither limit it, you wouldn't exclude it, nor would you necessarily put it down as a particular agenda. I don't believe that such a conference could design a specific agenda for your foreign ministers. You could only describe lines that they would take, the attitudes we have, and the general areas they would explore.

Q. Raymond P. Brandt, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: Mr. President, can you give us any idea of how long the meeting at the summit would take?

THE PRESIDENT. I can only tell you what it is I've been guessing. I would think that, oh, if you met a matter of 3 days, I think it would completely cover the issues, as far as I am concerned. All the issues could be raised.

Q. Mr. Brandt: How long would the foreign ministers meet, can you guess on that?

THE PRESIDENT. Oh, I wouldn't guess--I wouldn't guess.

Q. Mr. Brandt: Would that be a matter of weeks or months?

THE PRESIDENT. Could be; I wouldn't guess. And of course, after the foreign ministers meet, then you can establish if any progress was made at all. What you would probably establish would be numbers of meetings of experts in particular fields. There is no use really of speculating as to what the outcome of a chain of events can be. This is certainly experimental.

Q. Mr. Brandt: Would you go back to your old plan after the foreign ministers had come to some agreement, the Big Four would then meet again to formalize it?

THE PRESIDENT. I wouldn't know, I wouldn't know. It would certainly in that case have to be a--we would have to have developed sufficient confidence in what had been done, and it would have to have sufficient significance to us and to the world that it would be worthwhile to make a formal signing to be--something, let us say, historical.

Q. John Herling, Editors Syndicate: Down from the summit for a moment, sir, this has to do with a domestic problem. As you predicted last week, the Louisville and Nashville Railroad strike was settled through the appointment of an arbitrator, and I wonder whether you would care to comment on the role of arbitration in labor-management disputes generally, sir.

THE PRESIDENT. Oh, I don't think it would be profitable to launch into a discussion of my ideas about it, except I would express the greatest gratification that both sides here finally accepted arbitration, that the Mediation and Conciliation Board was successful in bringing them together, and the strike has been settled. It is a very great boon to the South, and I am very gratified.

Q. Mr. Herling: Sir, there is a strike still going on, the telephone strike.

THE PRESIDENT. Yes. I will be just as happy when that is settled.

Q. Mr. Herling: Through arbitration, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, they are working, the Mediation Service is still in contact.

Q. Mr. Herling: And therefore the pattern of arbitration will be just as useful?

THE PRESIDENT. In my opinion, yes.

Q. Elie Abel, New York Times: Sir, could you give us your views on whether you would favor a congressional delegation or a small group of congressional leaders going to this meeting at the summit with your party?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I wouldn't know yet. You must remember that there was an invitation issued, and we sort of described in our note what we thought would be a good procedure. We don't know whether that is going to be accepted. I would say this: when it comes down to anything definitive that is going, possibly, to result in any kind of formal agreement or treaty, then I would say it is always profitable to have a congressional committee with them.

Q. Mrs. May Craig, Maine Papers: Mr. President, I had understood you to say that you would require deeds from the Communists before you would meet with them, to show their specific attitude. Have you had any deeds of that description?

THE PRESIDENT. One of them I described was the signing of the Austrian Treaty. Now, it is true I talked about others, but if this one indicates what they are apparently trying to make it appear to indicate, well, then, I am going to try to find out whether it is absolutely sincere.

Q. Laurence H. Burd, Chicago Tribune: Mr. President, would you regard it as possible or likely that the Far Eastern situation might come up at such a conference, that is, that there wouldn't be any geographic limits?

THE PRESIDENT. It might be an agreement to limit it, in order to look for success, to limit it to certain areas. I would say at this top one, if you had the heads of government at the one conference, I would think the general conversations would tend to go around the world, be global in character.

Q. Lucian C. Warren, Buffalo Courier-Express: Speaker Rayburn on Monday raised the question about the way you make appointments, and it was in connection with your nomination of William Kern, an Indiana Democrat, to replace Jim Mead, a New York State Democrat, on the Federal Trade Commission; and Speaker Rayburn said on Monday that he thought it was cruelly handled, and a cruel thing to do. He also said he had not been consulted about any appointments for minority jobs, that is Democrats in Government, and also Majority Leader McCormack said that he had not been consulted. I wonder if you have any comment on that?

THE PRESIDENT. [NO, I have no comment on that.]

Q. Andrew F. Tully, Jr., Scripps-Howard: Mr. President, the Hoover Commission has reported a number of wasteful shopping practices on the part of the military; for instance, the 60-year supply of hamburger, and up on the Hill they are complaining that they can't seem to find anybody in the military to take responsibility for these things. I was wondering, sir, if you have any plans to hold anybody's feet to the fire about this? [Laughter]

THE PRESIDENT. All I getting a bad reputation around here?

Q. Mr. Tulley: As commander in chief.

THE PRESIDENT. I do know that Secretary Wilson and Mr. Hoover themselves have been in conference. I believe they exchanged letters and are getting together so that they can together study these things in detail, and see where difficulties are. I think there can be a lot of misunderstanding arise about just a bare fact. You may have a lot of hamburger. I understand this is for emergency purposes, used by the Navy and the Marines. I am told that if you actually fed it out to all the messes, that you could consume it in 5 days. But you don't do that. It is held for emergency purposes; and therefore, at the amount that you consume it, I don't know how many years it would last.

Q. Mr. Tully: Do you think that is not too much, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I haven't examined what they have, but I will tell you this: if you kept in your emergency ammunition supplies only the amounts that you use yearly for practice, you would be in an awful defensive fix. Now I don't know, I haven't looked up the details. I don't intend to, because Secretary Wilson ought to be capable of doing that, and I think you can get an answer from him.

Q. Marvin L. Arrowsmith, Associated Press: Mr. President, Senator Margaret Chase Smith is telling the Republican Women's Conference today that she hopes with all her heart that you will run again, but that her present impression is that you will not do so. Do you have any idea where she got such an impression?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, of course I would like to thank her for her complimentary opinion of me; but as for the rest of it, I haven't the slightest idea where she got that impression.

Q. James B. Reston, New York Times: Mr. President, in view of the confusion over the polio vaccine, sir

THE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Q. Mr. Reston:--would you give us your view as to where the responsibility lies in this situation? Is there a Government responsibility here?

THE. PRESIDENT. There is certainly a Government responsibility to take leadership in this thing and see the thing goes ahead as fast as it possibly can. Now, every conference I have had has been that the firms have cooperated perfectly--the firms making this. They have no complaint whatsoever. The entire amount of this product is contracted for by the Foundation. There will be no other orders filled of any kind until that contract is completely fulfilled. I believe it is either until all children from 5 to 9 are vaccinated, or until a given date some time in the future, whichever is earlier, I think. I would say this: during the week, I will have the final report of all the agreements, all the recommendations of the advisory board and the Secretary of HEW. By Monday or Tuesday I ought to be in shape to determine if there is any more action of any kind that I am expected to take.

Q. Mr. Reston: The question that is being asked, certainly the question that our mail reflects, is why many of these things that are now being done were not done before all the hoop-la about the original announcements in April.

THE PRESIDENT. I think it was merely because of two things: the great pressure to bring this out as quickly as they had any reason to believe it was a useful and effective product; and therefore, some of the exhaustive tests through which such a product normally goes, probably they tried to shortcut a little bit. I don't know; the report will have to show. I am not a scientist, as you well know.

Q. Edward P. Morgan, American Broadcasting Company: On that same subject, sir, during the last week of June 1949 the Cutter Laboratories of Berkeley, California, was convicted in Federal court in San Francisco on a 12-count indictment, alleging violation of the pure food and drug laws. In your opinion, sir--two questions--in your opinion, is that a matter that should have been taken into consideration by the Government in licensing Cutter for the production of Salk vaccine; and if so, would a situation of this kind be more easily handled by a situation such as Canada seems to be doing so successfully with government controls?

THE PRESIDENT. [Well, I never heard of the incident that you bring up, and certainly I wouldn't be in position at this moment to comment as to whether that has any possible effect on the current situation. It would seem to me that the people in it, the experts and doctors in HEW and the advisory commission brought in, would certainly be aware of all pertinent facts that you bring up; and if that had any influence, they would have taken it into consideration. I don't know.]

Q. Merriman Smith, United Press: Mr. President, you used a phrase two questions back on that, "they probably tried to shortcut a little bit." To whom are you referring, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. I meant that the scientists in putting this out probably thought that they had used all of the regular methods, but probably didn't use some of the more exhaustive ones that they may think now should be double-checked. Look, I am speculating on that particular point. I say I haven't got my report, and I am not making any statement that is to be taken as authoritative on that point, but they have stopped the vaccinations while they take a double-check on something. Now, what that is, I am not sure.

Q. Sarah McClendon, El Paso Times: Sir, I believe you received a letter from Congressman Bell the other day, setting forth the great social as well as economic effects of the drought on people in small towns, as well as farms and ranches. The Agriculture Department has set June 15th, I believe, as the end of much of the temporary relief to people in the drought area--in the hay program and other forms. I wonder if you had given any thought to a long-range program that would take into consideration the economic and social effects of the drought in the Southwest?

THE PRESIDENT. I don't know of any time that the matter isn't under discussion. Certainly for the 2 years and more that I have been here there has always been some area that is in drought. We have taken up this matter with Congress. We have done what we can, and I don't know how you can take up really long-range plans of such kinds, because you hope that the drought doesn't last forever. A drought is supposed to be an emergency.

Q. Mrs. McClendon: Sir, I believe Mr. Bell set forth that these people are going to need some works projects plans in a long-range way as well as temporary relief.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I am not prepared to talk about it this morning.

Q. Martin Agronsky, American Broadcasting Company: Mr. President, considerable misgivings seem to have arisen as to the efficacy of the Salk polio vaccine in a medical sense. Could you, from your knowledge and your conversations with the experts on this, tell us whether the U.S. Government still regards the Salk polio vaccine as able to do what everyone originally thought it would do; that is, prevent polio with 80 to 90 percent of those who are injected with the vaccine?

THE PRESIDENT. I believe it absolutely. I can't say what the Government--that's a lot of people. I know what I believe, I believe these experts. They are very competent and I believe it can do it. Now there have been, I think, something like 52 cases of polio out of more than five million injections. Now, they want to find out merely whether these 52 cases had any relationship at all to the fact that they were injected. They are trying to be doubly safe, and I applaud their caution in this matter. But I believe it just implicitly that this will, within a measurable time, really eliminate polio in this country.

Q. Mr. Agronsky: Mr. President, it is not the medical theory that is in question here at all, it is merely the manner that the vaccine is being manufactured.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, that is what I think.

Q. James A. Reynolds, Congressional Quarterly: Mr. President, what kind of progress would you say your legislative program has been making in Congress so far this year, and what kind of support would you say Republican Congressmen have been giving this program?

THE PRESIDENT. The question is too generic, too broad, for me to discuss this morning. I'd say

this: anyone that would attempt to predict or to comment very much on progress of Congress at this time has forgotten the Congress is capable of doing an awful lot, sometimes in a week, and then seems to have a period of inaction almost for a month. It is rather erratic in its output. [Laughter] I mean, erratic in the rate of output. I would say this: as far as I am concerned, things are coming along pretty well.

Q. Richard L. Wilson, Cowles Publications: Mr. President, has a decision been reached to allow Russian agricultural specialists to come to this country and study agriculture here?

THE PRESIDENT. I would like to answer definitively, but I am not certain. We have discussed it, and, generally speaking, I think it has. But I am a little bit uncertain whether I am talking about something that has yet been finally crystallized; that is my difficulty. Actually, I think it has been straightened out.

Q. Mr. Wilson: Do you still favor it?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Q. Matthew Warren, DuMont Television: Mr. President, yesterday the House apparently killed the hopes for Hawaii and Alaska for statehood, for some time to come. I wonder if you would comment on that, sir.

THE PRESIDENT. I have always favored, as you know, the separation of these two bills and handling each one on its merits. Now, if you put them together you instantly accumulate for your bill the opposition that applies to either one and to both. You take the aggregate and apply it to each one. I would like to see the bills separated, and always have stood for that. And I would still like to see it.

Q. Clark R. Mollenhoff, Des Moines Register: Mr. President, I wonder if you would have any comment on Zhukov's statement over the last weekend, in the light of your letters to him.

THE PRESIDENT. No, none. They have no connection whatsoever, the two incidents.

Q. Waiter Kerr, New York Herald Tribune: Mr. President, I wonder if you have had an opportunity to see a report on the latest Soviet disarmament plan.

THE PRESIDENT. On what?

Q. Mr. Kerr: On what has been described as the recent Soviet disarmament plan submitted to the summit.

THE PRESIDENT. You mean the one submitted through the Disarmament Commission in London?

Q. Mr. Kerr: Yes, sir.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I have just had a chance to glance at it.

Q. Mr. Kerr: Do you care to comment on it, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. No, not at the moment. The whole question is so confused. It has still some

of the elements they have always had in it. They want to get rid of one kind; we would like to get rid of everything. It is something that has to be studied before you can really comment on it.

Q. Charles S. von Fremd, CBS News: Over the weekend, sir, photographs of the May Day celebrations in Moscow indicated that ex-Premier Malenkov has now risen somewhat within his party again, and now ranks third, directly behind Bulganin and Khrushchev. I wonder, sir, on whatever indications you may have received through our intelligence people, whether this does indicate that there is still an unsettled thing going along in Moscow as to who actually is the supreme ruler.

THE. PRESIDENT. Well, I don't know whether this has any significance about it, but it certainly seems to be the case that the situation is not what it was when Stalin was alive. He seemed to have the situation in personal control every minute of the day. In other words, he was a true dictator. This is a somewhat different system.

Q. Ray L. Scherer, National Broadcasting Company: Have you had a chance to examine General Samoff's recommendations on cold war strategy?

THE PRESIDENT. He came to see me about it. We had a long talk.

Q. Mr. Scherer: I was wondering if you looked at the report.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, he discussed some of the things that he was going to put in it, and he went around and talked to various members of the Government. I believe thoroughly in General Sarnoff's general proposition, that when you are spending all the money we are for direct defense through security establishments, it is just unthinkable to limit ourselves too much in this whole field of information service that is necessary to a cold war.

Q. Mrs. May Craig, Maine Papers: Mr. President, I didn't know I could ask two questions. In reference to your reply on Austria, do you regard that as a satisfactory treaty or are we agreeing to it because we cannot get better?

THE PRESIDENT. Oh, we agreed to this treaty way back in 1949. Section 16 has been eliminated completely, which had to do with repatriation, and there are still some details to be ironed out. But as far as we are concerned, this Government has agreed to that treaty for many, many months.

Q. Robert G. Spivack, New York Post: Last week you told us that no child would be denied the vaccine because of inability to pay, and afterwards there seemed to be a little confusion about just what sort of plan of operation you had in mind. As I understood, the Federal Government, if necessary, would buy up all the Salk vaccine, but could you tell us how indigence would be determined, and also whether it would be administered free of charge.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, of course I can't tell you all the details of how we would do it, but I will tell you this: the second I find out that any child in the United States is denied this by reason of lack of money to pay for it, I am going to move as hard as I can, and I will certainly make someone listen to me very earnestly before there is any defeat on that one.

Q. William M. Blair, New York Times: Mr. President, over the weekend the Surgeon General of the United States changed his position on going ahead with the Salk vaccine. Was that purely a medical decision, or was that a decision of policy within the administration?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I don't understand any such question. I have discussed that two or three times this morning. That was the doctor's opinion and his decision. The Government would know no more about the factors in this than this body would. What would you know what to do with such technical things? I wouldn't. The doctors have to decide what to do in such a case. They decided it wasn't fair to go ahead until they checked more. That's all there was to it.

Merriman Smith, United Press: Thank you, Mr. President.

(99) Remarks of the President During Secretary Dulles' Television Report on His European Visit May 17, 1955

[Broadcast from the President's Office at 7pm. The full text of the broadcast was published in the Congressional Record vol. 101, p. 6605. The address of April 16, 1953 to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, referred to by the President, is published in the Department of State Bulletin vol. 28, p. 599.]

EL-Dl6-54 (RA)

FOSTER, it is good to have you here to tell us something of the significant events that took place during your recent visit to Europe. You realize that through the cameras in this room your report will go to the entire nation. And so I hope that in addition to the details of that trip, you will tell us something about the developing scene in the international field as you see it, and something of the prospects for real progress in our incessant search for peace.

[At this point Secretary Dulles stated that the week was so crowded with events he hardly knew how to start. The President then resumed speaking.]

Well, I will tell you, Foster, I think that it might be well to go clear back to 2 years ago. Then you will remember with our colleagues in the legislative branch in both parties the administration was developing the policies intended to produce, and basic to that policy was the belief--the conviction--that only through cooperative strength developed in the free world could we really face up to this threat that the communist dictatorship posed to all free men. We believed, as you know, that until Western Europe had been united, until there were some German forces joining the NATO organization, and until we had some confidence in the Russian word through deeds rather than mere protestation, that it would do little good to have talks with them. And you will realize that you and I finally decided that I should make some pronouncement along this line, and did so, on April 16 of 1953.

Now we agreed at that time that if we could through the kind of steps I have just mentioned, arrive at the point where we had a real basis for going ahead, even if only with faint hope of real progress, that we might finally develop between ourselves and with the Soviets a new relationship that would at least allow some hope of progress toward this great goal of peace that is of course the great dream of every American.

So, against that kind of backdrop, I think you could relate the events of recent times and on your--just your recent trip to Europe, to tell us about the story as you see it.

[At this point Secretary Dulles discussed Germany's membership in NATO, his talks with NATO Council members regarding Asian problems, and the signing of the Austrian State Treaty. He also discussed the proposed 4-power talks and the dangers as well as the opportunities in such a meeting, in particular the danger that hope would be raised so high that it couldn't be realized. The President then resumed speaking.]

Foster, I don't believe that danger is quite so great as it was once, because my mail shows this: that the American people are really pretty well aware of what is going on. They realize this is merely a beginning and not an end. I have taken tremendous hope and confidence from the tenor of the remarks I have seen in our newspapers, and commentators, and everybody else--I am sure that there is greater maturity than we would have expected several years ago.

[At this point Secretary Dulles discussed the implications of the Soviet policy shift, and spoke again of the proposed summit meeting. He stressed the need [or adhering to established policies having bipartisan support in undertaking the solution of problems at the meeting. The President then resumed speaking.]

In a word, we want to stay strong and will stay vigilant, but we are not going to extinguish the hope that a new dawn may be coming, even if it rises--the sun rises very, very slowly.

Thank you very much, Foster. It has been a real privilege to hear such a brilliant report on a very significant two weeks.

(100) President's Press Conference May 18, 1955 [President Eisenhower's sixty-ninth news conference was held in the Executive Office Building from 10:32 to 11:02am, in attendance: 202.]

EL-Dl6-69 (PC)

[This is a complete transcript of the news conference of this date. All of the President's replies were released for broadcasting or direct quotation at that time.]

THE PRESIDENT. I have no statement, ladies and gentlemen. We will proceed to questions.

Q. Marvin L. Arrowsmith, Associated Press: Mr. President, Senator Morse yesterday accused Mrs. Hobby of gross incompetency and said she should be removed from office. That was criticism in connection with the handling of the Salk vaccine program. Do you have any comment on those remarks or do you care to say how you feel Mrs. Hobby has been handling the program?

THE PRESIDENT. I will take the second part of your suggestion and talk about that. I don't think I would waste my time on the first part. Mrs. Hobby, in my opinion, has proved in her office that all of the good opinion built up about her in her work during the war as head of the WAC corps was fully justified. She has been highly efficient. Her counsel in the places of Government has been eagerly sought--a person of great character. In this whole Salk vaccine business, I think America is forgetting one thing: the thanks we owe to tremendous groups of

scientists, devoted doctors, people that have worked night and day, including the people in the Public Health Service, 20 hours a day, to bring to us this great boon for the protection of our children and grandchildren. Now, she herself has been, when you come down to it, merely the agent of these great scientists and doctors, to work out the plans through which they thought that their findings, and this vaccine, could be brought to our people in the earliest possible point of time, and so directed that those people who need it most, the children, would get it first. In this great anxiety to do the thing rapidly and broadly, there were certain scientific facts that weren't quite, let's say, wholly satisfactory to these scientists themselves. They were not sure that their test methods were as accurate as they should like. When they found certain evidence appearing, they went back to the job of testing again, and temporarily held up the distribution and administering of this vaccine. Now, the vaccine, I believe, of two companies--Parke, Davis and Lilly, I believe, are the names--have been released; and they are going ahead with this process so as to get it in full flow again. Mrs. Hobby has been at the center of this whole business of agreeing with the advisory committee how was the way to do it, how we can speed it up. But they always have held up this standard, safety, making certain that they are not doing something that would work against the life of the child, but to protect the life of that child. So I think that we really ought to remember at times the debt we owe all of those people for the devoted work they have put into this thing.

Q. Merriman Smith, United Press: Mr. President, Senator Symington wants to know whether this country has lost control of the air to Russia. Do you think so, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, that is a very generalized statement "lost control of the air."

As anybody who is experienced in warfare knows, control of the air is a relative thing, and anybody with a certain amount of air force in action can gain control over a place where he chooses to concentrate his air, for a temporary space of time, even in the face of quite great general superiority on the other side. The Germans did it to us as late as January 1, 1945. Those of you who were in the European theater on that day will remember what a drenching our airfields got even though we later destroyed a great deal of that attacking force. Now, as of today, most of you people are rather familiar with the character of our Air Force, including its scientific character. Back in about 1948-49, we began to build heavily these B-36, well knowing it was a transition aircraft. It was an aircraft that did give us a big intercontinental bomber at the same time that we knew that the day of the big jet bomber was coming along. But you have to standardize at different periods on particular types. Now, those B-36 planes were good planes for their day, and they are now being phased out as others will come along. So in the very new ones, since with this possession of this intermediate bomber we had a chance to work for a really fine type in the B-52 and its successors which will certainly come along, we may not have as many B-52's as we should like at this moment. I don't know the exact number, but to say that we have lost in a twinkling all of this great technical development and technical excellence as well as the numbers in our total aircraft is just not true.

Q. Charles E. Shutt, Telenews: Mr. President, in his report to the Nation last night, Secretary Dulles favored a cautious approach on the Big Four meeting. Some observers on Capitol Hill feel that that might be too timid an approach. Would you comment, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, no, because I can't--I don't quite understand the--I can't understand the question, really. Of course you are going to be cautious. "Cautious" means to proceed at

something no matter how hopefully, with caution for your own, let's say, safety, security, or other interests. Now, as I say, and, as Secretary Dulles said, we are approaching this thing now from a greater position of strength than we ever had before. We have the unity of Western Europe more nearly assured than before. We are now, by treaty, going to have German forces. We have the Austrian Treaty completed. We are in a better position than ever before. We are stronger. But that does not mean we will be less vigilant. Now, I don't mean to say that the search for evidences of good faith and the chances to, let's say, lower the burden of armaments and to bring about some progress in peace, they won't be any the less intensive. Of course, they will. But it does not mean, caution, that you are not going to hunt for peace, it means you are going to look out for yourself.

Q. Martin S. Hayden, Detroit News: Mr. President, going back to this airpower question, apparently Senator Symington was aroused because of a report that in Moscow they had seen a flight of new intercontinental bombers or something of the sort. I would like to ask you, sir, has there been any Russian air development reported that has thrown off your previous planning as to Russian air strength? In other words, have you been greatly startled by any of this.

THE PRESIDENT. I believe this: that from time to time, in several lines of scientific endeavor, aircraft and others, there has come in evidence that exceeded predictions of where they would be at any particular moment. I remember approving the statement that was issued on that aircraft. I have forgotten the details of it, so I want to be a little bit guarded in my speech. But we do know that they flew past-they didn't fly past on May Day, you know, it was bad weather-but in practice for the May Day they flew past several times, a number of airplanes, among which were a few items which, by the size of their engines, the size of the airframe, would certainly be capable of long-distance flight, carrying heavy loads. Now, what their condition is inside, what their readiness of technical perfection and all the things that we know go into one of these things, nobody knows.

Q. James B. Reston, New York Times: Sir, you told us 2 weeks ago, I believe, that you were proceeding, or the Government was proceeding, with direct conversations with Communist China about the situation in the Formosa Straits. Where do we stand on that now?

THE PRESIDENT. Proceeding, did you say?

Q. Mr. Reston: Well, I thought, I got the impression that the Government was looking into the possibility of direct negotiations.

THE PRESIDENT. I think the Secretary of State announced shortly after he came back from Asia, as I recall, that if there seemed to be profitable chances for talking on the one subject that he said, the cease-fire in the Straits, he would be quite ready to do it. I think there is nothing additional to add since then. I know of nothing that has occurred that would change his readiness or his receptiveness to that idea for that one purpose only. But I do not know of anything else on this day.

Q. Robert E. Clark, International News Service: Mr. President, this is a double Big Four question: do you think you might visit any other European city, as London or Paris, en route to or from a Big Four conference; and if it were possible, would you like to have Marshal Zhukov present at the Big Four conference?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I hadn't given any thought, Mr. Clark, to either question. As you know, I have a tremendous number of friends in both those cities, and on a friendly basis I would like to drop in. But there might be a lot of protocol questions that would make such a visit a very difficult affair. I couldn't say, to answer your second question, who the Soviets should choose as the personnel of their delegation. But if Marshal Zhukov were there, he and I at least would have a chance to talk personally and, I think, to talk over events since 1945 among ourselves. We might just get some item of value out of it; I am not sure.

Q. Pat Munroe, Salt Lake City Deseret News: Mr. President, we hear reports on Capitol Hill that both Russia and Great Britain will steal the show from American businessmen at the United Nations Atoms for Peace Conference in Geneva in August. Some say that our Atomic Energy Commission is actually discouraging industry in this country from putting its best foot forward. I wonder if you have any comment, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I should say someone is very badly mistaken in two ways. First, as to our purpose in going to this meeting, we are not going to this meeting to conduct a contest. As long ago as December 9, 1953, I asked publicly other nations of the globe to cooperate with us in placing before the entire world the knowledge concerning the possible peaceful uses of atomic energy. If anybody comes there ready to follow up along that line, and to show concretely and constructively that they are ready to devote the atomic science to the betterment of man and not to his destruction, I will applaud just as loudly as I know how, and particularly if that is an effective thing. Now, when it comes down to the discouragement by the AEC, the AEC then must be doing two things, because they are the ones that come to me and hold out in front of me the great opportunity we have here. The reactor that we are to put there--while it is a simple one, and one of the relatively less expensive--it is an actual operating reactor that we are putting in there, in cooperation with the Swiss Government and the Secretary General of the United Nations. We asked, I believe, 1100 scientists to prepare papers on this-no, we asked American scientists, I believe 1100 American scientists responded with papers that could be presented there on this business of peaceful uses. I forget the number of American industries that are cooperating. I expect it really to be a very splendid exhibition of what America, an aroused America, in this line can do. And, therefore, I can say this: I sincerely hope that others put their best foot forward because ours is going to be something that no one can laugh off. [Confers with Mr. Hagerty] Seventy-five industrial firms, I am given to understand.

Q. William H. Lawrence, New York Times: I wonder, sir, as a military man yourself, and as Commander in Chief, if you could give us your opinion as to the effect on both morale and the re-enlistment rate in the military forces, if all the commissaries and PX's were to be shut down as the Hoover Commission now suggests?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I am sorry you added the last two or three words, because--

Q. Mr. Lawrence: I will withdraw them, sir. [Laughter]

THE PRESIDENT. The reason being this, Mr. Lawrence: I have not read that report, and they may put in some qualifications. I have never believed in the uncontrolled spread of the Post Exchanges of the United States Army. But I believe that to take away the commissary privileges and the Post Exchange privileges from military, uniformed personnel, wherever they may be, when those are really needful things in order to give them the normal business of living, and give

it to them at a decent price, I believe it would be a terrible injustice to those people. On the other hand, it is one of those things in which just judgment must come in, in order that a privilege is not abused and becomes something that is intolerable.

Q. Edward J. Milne, Providence Journal: Mr. President, in connection with the NATO Council visit--some of us were at Norfolk the other day--Admiral Wright was not himself doing any griping, but there was some suggestion that, perhaps, the forces assigned to SACLANT are not adequate for the mission. I wonder if you, in connection with the visit, would care to comment on your views on the adequacy of this strength.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, no, I can't because I have not heard the complaint, and the Navy Department has not brought up to me lately detailed reports of the strength of SACLANT.

Q. Mr. Milne: Would you feel from what you do know, sir, in general, that we are relatively better off in terms of a new battle of the Atlantic than we were during the opening of World War II?

THE PRESIDENT. I think so, by all odds.

Q. Robert J. Donovan, New York Herald Tribune: Mr. President, I wonder if I could ask these two questions: it was reported last week that Mrs. Hobby, for purely personal reasons and not because of the Salk controversy, would leave the Government in a few months. One, I wondered if you had heard of that and, two, I wondered, sir, if you could comment on the supply of this vaccine. It seems to be shorter than we had expected; and I wondered if you had had any report and knew how much was available or whether you are going to ask for

THE PRESIDENT. Mr. Donovan, I will do my best to answer both questions. But you must realize that as much as I do my homework to keep up with the business of this Government, there are details that really could be best answered in some of the departments rather than to come to me. First, Mrs. Hobby placed me on notice some many months ago that conditions might arise that would compel her to leave Government. Now, the only thing I will say about it is this: if she has to go, I will be very, very disappointed. I think she has not only proved her own worth, but I think she is a symbol of something in which I very deeply believe: that properly trained women of this country are just as capable of carrying heavy executive jobs as are the men. And I think she has done a mighty magnificent job. Now, as to supply, the report I had this morning was that-what time was it? [Confers with Mr. Hagerty] Yes. They have enough in their hands for the first go-around, that is, the first shot of all the people that they had calculated on, that is, the first and second grades. If some of those shots are not given by the time that school is out, particularly in the South, their plan is to set up days for meeting either at the schoolhouses or other places where these shots will be given. So the only estimate I was given this morning on amounts was that they had enough on hand and in sight to do that.

Q. Ray L. Scherer, National Broadcasting Company: Mr. President, can you shed any light on the report that there is a plan for Mr. Nixon to make a good will trip to Europe, including a possible stop-off in Moscow?

THE PRESIDENT. No such plan has been mentioned to me.

Q. Ray L. Scherer, National Broadcasting Company: Mr. President, can you shed any light on

the report that there is a plan for Mr. Nixon to make a good will trip to Europe, including a possible stop-off in Moscow?

THE PRESIDENT. No such plan has been mentioned to me.

Q. Sarah McClendon, El Paso Times: Sir, the military reserve manpower bill was changed somewhat, as you know, by the House Armed Services Committee, and there was quite a talk yesterday in the House by Congressman Brooks of Louisiana about the buildup of the Red Forces, in addition to other reports on the airpower we have been getting. I wonder if you still think, in view of these changes, that this bill will be sufficient to give this country, if passed, the protection it needs?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, this bill, of course, I would not claim is perfection in the sense of getting our military manpower trained and prepared as I should like to see it, but it represents a very great step forward. Consequently, I support it not only passively, I support it very actively, and urgently hope that it will be passed; although later, unquestionably, we will find features in which we will want to improve it even more.

Q. Garnett D. Horner, Washington Star: Mr. President, can you tell us yet your views about the postal pay raise bill which Republican leaders in Congress predict you will veto?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I haven't been studying more earnestly for a long time than I am studying on that bill. As a matter of fact, I have studied a couple of hours this morning. I am still studying that bill.

Q. Alan S. Emory, Watertown Times: Mr. President, on Monday Secretary Hobby told the Senate Labor Committee that no one could have foreseen the public demand for the anti-polio vaccine. What do you think was the difficulty in foreseeing the great public demand for the vaccine?

THE PRESIDENT. I don't know to what she is referring. You have to go and ask her the question.

Q. Lawrence Fernsworth, Concord (New Hampshire) Monitor: Mr. President, the plight of the American Indians has recently been discussed in a certain sector of the press, Look magazine, and a church publication. One of these articles talks of the Indians from South Dakota as being obliged to haul water in rusty barrels from 30 to 100 miles; talks of disease, poverty, and high infant mortality. It describes the plight of the average American Indian as being little better than was the plight of the refugees in Korea. One of the proposals suggested in one of these articles is a 4-point program for the American Indian. Another is a relocation program. Now, it has been noted that one of the pledges during the Republican campaign was that this matter, the welfare of the American Indians, would receive attention. Could the President tell us whether any progress has been made in that direction? The particular case you bring up, I don't know about. I will look it up, because I agree with your implicit criticism, if such conditions exist, it is high time they were stopped. I think it can be stopped.

Q. Walter Kerr, New York Herald Tribune: Mr. President, in its recent note--

THE PRESIDENT. Would you identify yourself?

Q. Mr. Kerr: I beg your pardon, sir, Walter Kerr of the Herald Tribune.

THE PRESIDENT. Thank you.

Q. Mr. Kerr: In its recent note to the Soviet Government proposing Four Power talks, the United States, like Britain and France, has suggested an exchange of views on the great problems of the day. I wonder if you would care, either today or perhaps at an early conference to come, if you would care to discus what you regard as what great problems you had in mind when you approved the text of that note.

THE PRESIDENT. I think that Mr. Dulles pointed out last evening that the purpose of this one conference would be to try to discover directions or paths for searching for solutions to these great problems. I think he enumerated some of them, such as the problem of the satellite states, the unification of Germany, the--I forget the adjective he used, but at least the penetration of so many nations supported by the Cominform, the international communistic organization. He named a few of that kind, and that is the kind of thing, I think, that would probably be mentioned as you search for ways that these should be approached. Would you set up special groups? Would you turn it over to ordinary diplomatic exchanges, or what could you do? That is the kind of thing I think would be talked about.

Q. Chalmers M. Roberts, Washington Post and Times Herald: Mr. President, last night you used the phrase that you felt there was a greater maturity among the American people now than some time ago when you were discussing the possible-

THE PRESIDENT. If I used the word "maturity," I probably meant knowledge or understanding, in that sense. Some years back, I was struck by the fact that we were probably going to extremes in this thing. It was either black or white. You either had a war right now, or peace that was wonderful, and you would get it. I believe that people have learned through a dozen attempts, through rebuffs, through the reading in the newspapers and hearing on the television and the radio about the process and progress of these conferences, that you don't expect too much. But, on the other hand, you don't ignore any chance to reach some agreement that may represent one tiny step toward this great aspiration of men. Now, I should possibly not have used the word "maturity," but I do mean knowledge and understanding of these facts.

Q. Mr. Roberts: I was wondering, sir, whether that phrase or thought covered this aspect: there have been some people in Congress, including members of your own party, who appear to take the position that even to go to such a conference is an act of appeasement. And I wondered if you felt that that attitude was really not expressive of the American people today.

THE PRESIDENT. I don't believe it for a minute. May I be personal? I have met with these people through months, and there is no appeasement in my heart that I know about. As I understand, appeasement is selling out fights or other people to gain some fancied immediate end of your own. I just can't believe that America in general either wants it or that they suspect their government in general is apt to fall into that trap.

Q. Edward P. Morgan, American Broadcasting Company: Following up Mr. Roberts' question, and referring somewhat to both your and Mr. Dulles' observations last night about maturity and sophistication of American thinking, as reflected in your mail, and so forth, do you think, sir, that we may have to make a rather deep adjustment in our thinking under the light of present

developments abroad on such things as East-West trade, and what neutrality for Germany means in both Russian and other terms?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think this: certain sectors of our population unquestionably will have to make adjustments, because they have not thought these things through. You can say one thing: trade is the greatest weapon in the hands of the diplomat. Now, how he uses it, whether it is in negative fashion or in positive fashion, to gain the legitimate ends of his government, that is great statesmanship and, particularly, international statesmanship. So, just to adopt a policy and say, "We won't trade," and think that only good will come out of that is, I think, false. We have to say "When does trade in what things benefit us most and our friends." Remember, we have got friends in this world; this business of trade is a very complicated business. So I would say as long as we are not helping the war-making powers directly of other people, we should study the question objectively and what it means to us, and not just go by preconception.

Q. Mr. Morgan: Could you just

THE PRESIDENT. I am trying to get around as far as I can.

Q. George H. Hall, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: There have been some suggestions that the Hoover Commission wants to make some changes or rather the Hoover Commission task force wants to make some changes in the setup of the TVA. Would you like to see any change whatever in the setup as it is now constituted?

THE PRESIDENT. Well now, that is a question I couldn't say, because as much as I have been in this TVA in question-and-answer periods, I certainly don't know all the details of its organization. I think that the Hoover Commission has served a very great purpose for this country. And this time, you remember, the second time, it not only had strictly organizational problems, it had organizational and functional problems to take up. In other words, was the Government in business it shouldn't be in, or should it get into something that it wasn't in, or was it doing it in the right way or in the right places? It has had a very broad charter under which to operate. As its subcommittee reports come up to the committee itself, they will be studied by the combined brains of some very great Americans. Finally, they come to the executive department and to the Congress simultaneously. Some answers are reached. Now, just exactly what they proposed here, I don't know. But I would say this: as you will recall, we will never wreck the TVA. It is a going historical concern. It's served a useful purpose. It was put up for particular purposes and, actually, if you go back to the original bill, I don't think many people can quarrel about the purposes for which it was originally set up.

Q. Henri Pierre, LeMonde (Paris): Mr. President, would you care to comment about the next visit of the Soviet leaders in Yugoslavia and, generally speaking, about the idea of a neutrality belt of states between the two worlds?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, no, I cannot even say what is behind this visit, except, obviously, there is hope of rapprochement of some kind, that we don't know the details about at all. And I do say this: that there seems to be developing the thought that there might be built up a series of neutralized states from north to south through Europe. Now, remember this: in the agreement of the neutralization of Austria, it does not mean a disarmed Austria. It is not a blank, it is not a military blank. It is on the order of Switzerland. Switzerland is committed to the sustaining of its

own neutrality and, I believe, would fight to the death for it. All right. That kind of a neutrality is a far different thing from just a military vacuum.

Merriman Smith, United Press: Thank you, Mr. President.

(103) Remarks to the President's Committee on the Employment of the Physically Handicapped May 23, 1955

[The President spoke at the annual meeting of the Committee in the Departmental Auditorium at 10am. His opening words "General Maas, Judge Cathey" referred to Melvin J. Maas, Chairman of the Committee, and Sam M. Cathey, Judge of the Police Court of Asheville, NC who was chosen as "Handicapped American of the Year".]

EL-Dl6-34 (IR)

General Maas, Judge Cathey, Prizewinners in the Essay Contest, and Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is a great privilege to meet again with this Committee, even though my meeting with you is for a few brief moments only.

We have a country dedicated to equality of opportunity. We make much in many Fourth of July speeches that this equality of opportunity goes to all, regardless of race, color, religion, and so on. It seems to me that we might extend it, at least within our own hearts and minds, to include: "Or to any who may be somewhat physically different or handicapped so long as that person can be made a useful member of society."

No one wants to be a ward of charity. Indeed, this word "opportunity" seems to me to contain much that means happiness for the human--opportunity to expand and to be useful, to know that he is contributing his share to the advancement of that great society of which he is a part.

I think it even goes this far: we can differentiate between a government that is based upon individual opportunity, and one that is based upon regimentation, in this way: opportunity brings that richness of productivity in which all may share. Individual initiative, harnessed together for the good of the whole, is the most productive inspiration and impulse we have.

Regimentation does nothing but distribute deficits--deficits that occur when we don't take advantage of these great impulses in the human heart and mind to produce what he can for himself and for his society.

I repeat I believe, therefore, that opportunity--individual opportunity and freedom--enriches a whole society, and regimentation merely distributes the losses that have occurred.

So it seems to me we cannot afford for one moment to neglect placing opportunity in front of all that are capable of doing anything whatsoever with it. And the mere fact that a person may be minus a limb or one of his senses, or anything else, has nothing to do with it, any more than do the other differences among humans that we conclude should not be allowed to sway us in the government that is applied to all.

I could think of no greater service that this Committee over the years has contributed to the United States than to bring to each--not only the handicapped people themselves, but to all of us-

-the fact that opportunity does truly belong to all. We are not going to be satisfied until it is brought to them, and they are allowed to take full advantage for their own betterment and that of our glorious country.

Thank you so much for the opportunity to be with you once again. It is truly a great privilege. Good morning.

(105) Remarks to the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters May 24, 1955

[The President spoke at the Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, DC at 11:30am. His opening words "President Fellows" referred to Harold E. Fellows, President of the Association.]

EL-Dl6-55 (RA)

President Fellows, ladies and gentlemen:

It is a great honor to appear before this distinguished body. In my mind there is some doubt as to the exact capacity in which I do appear. I see some of my friends of the press here. They know that I have been on Presidential press conferences where there has been television present. So it raises a question--Do I come as a co-worker or as a sponsor?

I understand that this is the first time in the history of your organization that a President has appeared before you. Governments notoriously move slowly, and sometimes this is a virtue. But I think that after this length of time, it is safe to make a tentative conclusion that radio and television are here to stay, and a President, therefore, can afford to take them quite seriously. Actually, not only here to stay but a mighty force in our civilization, one that is certain to grow. And because it will grow and be more powerful in its influence upon all of us, conventions such as this have very deep social and professional problems to consider, on which they must reach proper conclusions.

Nothing has been so important to us as an informed public. As long ago as Jefferson's time he said were he forced to choose between a government without schools or schools without government, he would unhesitatingly take a civilization in which he had schools without government, well knowing that an informed public would soon discover the need for government and establish a proper one among themselves. And in the reverse case, he apparently did not know what might happen, because government with an uninformed public can be, as we know, very vicious.

One of the things that has made us an informed public is the fact that we have had a free press, and now these great institutions, the radio and the television, have moved in to take their place alongside the older media of mass communications. And this means, if we are to draw any lessons from the past, that they in turn must be free.

It behooves you, then, I think, to discover the formulae and to evolve them among yourselves and to announce them and to follow them so that they will keep these great media free in the truest sense of the word.

We must not wait for governmental regulation, or compulsory governmental intervention in the form of suits and anti-trust actions and all the rest. We must grow up with this great force, assuring the freedom of people to express their proper opinions, with the whole industry governed by the same rules that govern newspapers, the normal rules of decency and good taste. As long as those are observed, any proper opinion--any opinion--can be expressed before the public.

There is a tremendous responsibility here--in some ways, I think, transcending that that is placed before the publisher. The publisher puts in your home a piece of print. It is essentially cold--although, of course, we admit that some writers have an ability to dress it up and make even disagreeable facts at times look fairly pleasant. But with the television or with the radio, you put an appealing voice or an engaging personality in the living room of the home, where there are impressionable people from the ages of understanding on up.

In many ways therefore the effect of your industry in swaying public opinion, and I think, particularly about burning questions of the moment, may be even greater than the press, although I am sure that my friends here of the press will have plenty to criticize in that statement. Nevertheless, it is something different, and you do introduce personality as well as cold fact. I think, again, that places added responsibility to see that the news, in those areas of the radio and television field that have to do with the dissemination of facts, is truthfully told, with the integrity of the entire industry behind it.

I once heard an expression with respect to newspaper standards: the newspaper columns belong to the public and the editorial page belongs to the paper. And, for myself, I find that an easy standard to follow and to apply as I examine a newspaper. I should think that some such standard could be developed among you. Of course you want to entertain. Of course you want people to look at it, and I am all for it. And I think everybody else is. But when we come to something that we call news--and I am certain that I am not speaking of anything you haven't discussed earnestly among yourselves--let us simply be sure it is news. Let all of the rest of the time be given to entertainment or the telling of stories or the fanciful fairy tales that we sometimes find in other portions of publications.

Now, to remain free, the government does have to interfere or to intervene, possibly, in your industry more than it does in those that deal with the printed word. After all, there seems to be only one canopy of air over the United States and in the rest of the world, and so there must be some means of deciding who is to use the various channels available. We shall always hope, of course, that that is done fairly and without any relationship of partisan politics or any other inconsequential factor so far as this great medium and problem is concerned. But beyond that one necessary intervention and the enforcement, as I said, of the rules of decency, my only plea is this: that you people take thought and counsel among yourselves to insure that this medium--these two great media--remain free--completely free of domination of any unfair kind and they belong to the people. Thus, as I see it, you will do a great and growing part in informing the public.

Now, just a moment on my favorite subject. I quoted Jefferson to you but I think if Jefferson were alive today he would state the proposition in language so much more emphatic than he then used that you would scarcely recognize the similarity. Never was it so important as it is today that the American public is informed. We have burning questions abroad that stretch from a four-

power conference around the world to the Indonesian crisis--the Indo China crisis. It is absolutely essential that the Americans know the actual facts of these problems. Moreover, that they be helped to gain an understanding of the relationship between these facts, because knowledge alone, necessarily--always remember--is not sufficient. We must understand.

We must understand the relationship between the farmer working in Kansas in a wheat field, and the need for wheat in far off Pakistan or some other country. We must understand these things if we are to know why we have to promote trade, why we have to promote truth about our country abroad, why we are so anxious to take America in picture and in word and in printed form, and indeed in our arts, in our entertainment of troops, to other countries, to let them see, insofar as we may: What is America? Why are we so proud of it? Why has it brought the greatest standard of living and given the greatest opportunity for intellectual and spiritual development? This is the way that we must win the so called cold war. This is the way that we must win our way to peace.

I think everybody in the television and radio professions has a right to think of himself as a man bearing a great responsibility as a crusader and help to do this job of education, of ourselves and of others about us, and to bring home here an understanding of what goes on in the rest of the world.

I think today Jefferson's statement might be paraphrased to say: If I had to have international free communications or some kind of world government that could enforce the peace, I would unhesitatingly choose complete, free, international communications. And then we would be sure that we would find ways for sovereign nations to achieve man's age-old aspiration: peace among men with prosperity fairly shared by all.

I repeat, my friends, it has been a great honor to appear before you. If I have started a precedent, I am very proud of it, and I do trust that future Presidents will find it not only convenient but practically necessary to appear before you and tell you, in their turn, what is on their hearts at the moment.

Thank you, and good morning.

(108) Remarks at the Dedication of the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology, Walter Reed Medical Center

May 26, 1955 [The President's opening words "Mr. Secretary, General DeCoursey" referred to Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense, and Brig. Gen. Elbert DeCoursey, Director of the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology.]

EL-Dl6-34 (IR)

Mr. Secretary, General DeCoursey, distinguished guests, my old friends of the Service, and ladies and gentlemen:

For the enlightenment of this audience, it is indeed fortunate that Dr. DeCoursey saw fit to tell us about pathology. Because for myself, I assure you, I have learned more in the last five minutes than I knew in my entire life before.

But I did not come here to talk scientifically and that is my excuse for not being better briefed in

that particular subject. We are here today to dedicate a great building of stone and concrete and other materials. This in itself is an important event, because I am told that this building is arranged better and more efficiently for the conduct of the work here to be done than any other that this country has erected.

A good workman deserves good surroundings, and a good place in which to work, and so if we had nothing more here to dedicate than the building itself, it would still be an occasion worthy of note.

But the true dedication is probably more to the impulses which led to the erection of this building. Concern for human life, and not merely to lengthen out the span of our years, although to some of us here present this in itself is getting important, but to ease man of sufferings and difficulties and the lengthening of life's span so that he may yield to the common good more from the God-given talents that are his, so that he can contribute more to the spiritual and intellectual and cultural and economic development of our time.

Another impulse is that of cooperative effort. The Secretary spoke of an example of unification. I think some years ago those of us who were advocating unification of the Services saw something of this kind in the offing, even though we were ignorant of the exact form these developments would take. For that reason, I couldn't be happier that all of the Services are combined in this effort.

And then I think it gives us an example of how government should operate in providing and doing its part in advancing the welfare of our nation and our people. Lincoln said, you know, "The function of government is to do for people those things which they cannot do at all or so well do for themselves, but in those things which people can do better, the government ought not to interfere." Here is one of those typical partnership efforts that bring government and science and individuals all together to do a great job for humanity.

If we review only some of the accomplishments of the medical services of the united services, we would have a very long list. Following our armed units into the far comers of the globe, they have brought back to us a knowledge of diseases, or they have practically prevented them from ever reaching our shores. But I remember very well in the days of my youth when the term "yellow jack" was one of terror in the West and Southwest. People would not even venture into some of our coastal cities in the South because of the fear of yellow fever. Yet Service personnel, through their dedication, and their training, their devotion, brought about a knowledge of that disease and began to stamp it out, and finally practically eliminated it.

So in the same fashion, other diseases coming under control have each had as one of the contributing factors these great dedicated officers, doctors and technicians, nurses and others of the Armed Services' Medical Corps.

So here we see people working in the conviction that man--man himself--is important, his health, his ability to contribute. We see also the conviction that man, under God, can conquer his physical surroundings and make this place--this world--a better place in which to live. All of these thoughts, all of these impulses come together, as we think of the erection of this building and the services it is going to perform; and indeed it inspires us.

And so I should first like to pay my tribute to the men who thought of this building, the men

whose work brought about here a proper home for the people working in this pathology for the united services. I want to pay tribute to all people who in any way have had a part in the development of the whole institution from the time of the Civil War, and to the accumulation here on this spot of the combined assets that will do so much for us.

So we can hope that this will make men more productive, their lives more rewarding, and in so doing, perhaps we will have a more secure country, a more peaceful world.

And so I dedicate this building to the conquest of disease so that mankind, more safe and secure in body, may more surely advance to a widely shared prosperity and an enduring and just peace.

Thank you very much.

(110) Remarks at Presentation of the National Security Medal to J. Edgar Hoover May 27, 1955

EL-Dl6-35 (IR)

The President of the United States takes pride in presenting the National Security Medal to JOHN EDGAR HOOVER for service as set forth in the following CITATION:

As Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for 31 years, he has made an outstanding contribution to the national security of the United States. Exercising exceptional tact, perceptiveness, judgment, and brilliant leadership in a position of great responsibility, he has established the highest ideals of federal law enforcement and has directed them to realization. His tireless efforts have brought to a new height of effectiveness the law enforcement machinery of the United States Government. Through his well-grounded and clearly defined concept of investigative procedures, reinforced by his recognized integrity and high personal prestige, he has won international recognition for the federal law enforcement system of the United States.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

[Remarks of the President]

Mr. Hoover, your dedication and devotion to public service are so long and so well known, your accomplishments in that service are so great and so well known, that it seems idle for me to try to say anything that could add to the dignity of this ceremony.

Perhaps it is just best for me to say I am proud to be an agent for our people in conferring upon you this highest award that the Government has, and to say that your real reward--as all of us here know--is in the hearts, the thanks and the gratitude of our entire nation.

NOTE: The President spoke in the Rose Garden. Mr. Hoover's response follows:

Thank you, Mr. President. I am deeply grateful for this honor which you have accorded me. I realize that it has been brought about through the dedicated accomplishments of the personnel and my associates in the Federal Bureau of Investigation, as well as by the magnificent support which you as President and which the Attorney General has afforded us over the years.

It is a pleasure, indeed, to serve as one of your subordinates.

(112) President's Press Conference May 31, 1955

[President Eisenhower's seventieth news conference was held in the Executive Office Building from 10:32 to 11:05am, in attendance: 165.]

EL-Dl6-70 (PC)

THE PRESIDENT. Good morning, please sit down.

I have several little announcements. First, as to personal activities, the month of June looms up as a very busy one for me. I am going to West Point on the 5th, I believe; Penn State on the 11th; I am going then to participate in this relocation exercise in the middle of the month.

Then on the 20th I am going out to extend the greetings of the American people on the opening of the United Nations. That will be on the 20th.

And then, from the 22d to the 27th, I am in New England. It is possible that some of those absences will catch a Wednesday, I am not sure. This is an odd day, too; this is Tuesday, isn't it? [Laughter] About the four fliers: we have been in, of course, some communication about these things now for some days.

The four fliers arrived in Hong Kong, I believe, at 2:30 our time this morning, left there at 4:30, are on their way now to Honolulu. The families of these four people have been contacted by the Secretary of the Air. He is picking up close members of the families, and is going to take them to Honolulu to meet them. That should take place, I guess, some time tomorrow evening, something of that kind.

Now, I want to talk a little bit about polio; the polio program seems to be losing some of its difficulties and inescapable snarls.

Of course, there has been delay. The delay has been brought about by two things: the care that was necessary in giving the tests, repeating the tests, to make certain that children and youngsters were not unduly exposed due to preventable cause; and, second, the new problems discovered by the producers in the mass production of this kind of a product.

I should like myself to give two words of caution to everybody. No vaccine is perfect protection against disease. You will remember that Dr. Francis found this one effective in, I believe it was a range of 60 to 90 percent, depending upon the range.

But I believe also it was found that any child having taken this vaccine had acquired an immunity that was three times as great as one who had not taken it. And then we must remember that it does take time for these great factories, when they are working on a mass production basis, to retool, get their machinery and everything in order, so that they both meet the tests and produce the volumes that are needed.

Now, as to distribution, remember I told you that the first priorities went to children, the first and the second grade. They were the ones that had been specified by the polio foundation-supported, of course, by all our doctors and scientists.

Within the next 30 days all the vaccine will be produced to carry out that program. Certainly

within the next 60 days it will be complete. After that, the Federal Government will be responsible for the allocation of the vaccine as it comes out in volume to the States to meet the needs of the 5 to 9 group first; and the States will be responsible after they have their properly allocated amounts to make certain that the methods and distribution have taken place in accordance with the regulations.

The Government, of course, to make certain that no child is denied this vaccine because of money, has asked for $28 million; I most earnestly hope that legislation will soon be enacted. A very favorable development, one point that has been questioned by some, has been the assurance that doctors will observe the priorities established by the Government in cooperation with the scientists who have been working on the problem. We have the pledge of the American Medical Association that doctors will observe these priorities and will themselves keep complete records of every child who is vaccinated, so that we can get the exact results of this whole great process as the year rolls on.

I think that covers all the--I said I was going to the United Nations--yes.

I have no further statements. We will go to questions.

Q. Robert E. Clark, International News Service: Mr. President, do you have any word about prospects for obtaining release of the other 52 Americans still held by Red China, including the other American flyers?

THE PRESIDENT. No, not at this moment.

Q. Merriman Smith, United Press: Mr. President, could you clarify that 30- to 60-day reference you made? You said--

THE PRESIDENT. Well, General Scheele assures me that within 30 days we will have, tested and on the shelves, the vaccine to carry out this entire program of the polio association, and that certainly within 30 days after that it will have been completed, actually administered.

Q. Mr. Smith: You mean administered?

THE PRESIDENT. Actually administered.

Q. Ray L. Scherer, National Broadcasting Company: Do you think the release of the flyers by the Chinese Communists represents a sincere effort on the part of the Chinese Communists to relieve tensions?

THE PRESIDENT. Our messages from various sources imply that that is their stated thought; that it was a token on their part to do something in helping release tensions. But I must say that everything that happens in the world these days has to be studied, examined, and, I would say, more carefully watched than would be implied in just a hit-or-miss guess as to what it means at this moment.

Q. Charles S. von Fremd, CBS News: Mr. President, at this very moment on Capitol Hill the Senate Labor Committee is holding a closed door meeting, and the indications are that they will recommend that you be given sweeping standby powers to handle the many problems of the Salk anti-polio vaccine. Do you desire such powers, and could you discuss this?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, this is what I believe: I believe the American people are doing this in pretty good fashion. I believe the polio program is coming along better than we could have expected, unless we would have counted on a degree of luck that was almost a phenomenon. I think the voluntary program is working. I don't know that we need anything extra. I have not seen the bill in its details. But if they vote standby powers of some kind, why, of course, I shall carry out whatever is expected of me.

Q. Kenneth M. Scheibel, Gannett Newspapers: Mr. President, there are reports that you have selected Mr. Folsom of the Treasury Department to replace Mrs. Hobby in your Cabinet. Would you comment on that, please?

THE PRESIDENT. Why, that is a very simple one: Mrs. Hobby has not resigned.

Q. Mr. Scheibel: Do you expect her to resign, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. I am not expecting anything. We all know that she has a very difficult domestic problem. Now she is carrying on as well as she can under those conditions, and I don't know what is going to happen.

Q. Charles E. Egan, New York Times: Mr. President, there have been frequent reports that your advisers, including Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, have told you that you can balance the budget next year and cut taxes. Would you care to comment on that, please?

THE PRESIDENT. Could balance the budget and cut taxes?

Q. Mr. Egan: Both.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, of course, that would be a wonderful thing. I think no one has said it to me in those emphatic terms. It would be a wonderful thing to have both. But I am sure that the first thing we must do is balance the budget.

Q. Robert J. Donovan, New York Herald Tribune: Four weeks ago we reached an agreement with Turkey, sir, on the bill authorizing Turkey to build atomic research reactors in Turkey. At the time there were indications that there might be further agreements along this line. Could you tell us whether any of those have come about?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think within the week there will be four to five or something of that kind, maybe even as many as six, new agreements signed and announced.[1]

[1]Later in the day the White House announced the signing of proposed agreements with Brazil and Colombia. Similar agreements with the United Kingdom, Canada, and Belgium were signed on June 15; see Item 123, below.

Q. Robert G. Spivack, New York Post: Mr. President, in connection with the vaccine, there is one question that seems to be bothering some parents. You will recall that when the vaccine was first given out, when children were first immunized or first inoculated, they were told that the second shot had to be given 4 or 5 weeks later. Now, in some cases that 4- or 5-week period has passed, and some people wonder if the shot wears off, or the effect wears off. I wonder if Dr. Scheele or anyone else has discussed that with you?

THE PRESIDENT. They have told me about a succession of two shots to be followed, I believe,

7 months or more later by a booster. But now the point that it may not be available for the second shot and they are worrying as to whether they are going to get it soon, I have not heard it discussed at all.

Q. Mr. Spivack: You don't know if they would have to get another shot, you mean?

THE PRESIDENT. No. I don't know, but I do know we are publishing about noon a rather lengthy statement on the thing. And I will have that question looked up and included, if it is possible. [Addresses Mr. Hagerty] Will you do that?

Q. Mrs. May Craig, Maine Papers: Mr. President, in relation to budget and tax cuts, does the revelation of progress in Soviet aircraft mean that you might have to increase your budget for our air defense?

THE PRESIDENT. I haven't had any such recommendations yet from the Air. There has been, of course, a greater number of these planes exposed to view, as I remarked at another press conference, than we had anticipated they would have at that moment. But there are many, many factors, as I tried to explain that morning. One of them is that we have an interim plane, the B-36, which is still a very good plane. We have had the others coming off, and we did authorize the factories that are producing 52's to step up their actual production. But whether or not that will require any change in the budget, I am not yet sure.

Q. Lloyd M. Schwartz, Fairchild Publications: Mr. President, the Defense Production Act is due to expire on June 30, and the administration reportedly has been considering whether to ask Congress to amend it to include emergency price and wage control authority for use in case of an emergency. I wonder if you could clarify just what the administration's position is on this proposal?

THE PRESIDENT. I have discussed that question so often in this group it seems to me, at least, to be almost a waste of time to repeat my views. They have not changed. I have always believed that on balance it would be a good thing to have certain controls if they could be strictly limited and quiet people's fears in times of peace. But the fears do exist on the part of a great portion of our people that these controls, if there, would be improperly exercised. The psychological situation, therefore, has always seemed to me to make it unwise to ask for them, and on the theory that the Congress would probably be in session or could be quickly called into session if an emergency arose.

Q. Sarah McClendon, El Paso Times: Sir, you nominated a Mr. John Brown of Houston for a place on the Fifth Circuit Court, and Mr. Brown allegedly at one time was an attorney for a shipping company that was involved in the Texas City disaster. The Government was on one side represented by the Justice Department. Now there has come forward a report that some paper was allegedly changed by this gentleman, and the Justice Department though, although they were on the opposite side with him, apparently later gave a recommendation for him to be a judge of the Fifth Circuit Court, which is the same court that had jurisdiction over this Texas City case. I wonder if you knew of these facts and took this under consideration when you nominated him?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, assuming that they are facts, I knew nothing about them. Now, I go over the record of every single man that is appointed a judge. I go over it carefully, and wherever possible I bring him in, to meet him. I have attempted to appoint to the Federal judiciary only the

finest people in the locality, people that are recommended by the American Bar Association, who have the recommendations of the people of standing in the community as to character and ability, quality, and so on. I never heard such a word about Mr. Brown.

Q. Martin S. Hayden, Detroit News: Sir, I would like to ask two related questions, if I could. In Detroit there is apparently increasing danger of an automobile strike in one or two of the big companies. Does the administration feel that the economic results of such a strike would be such as to require immediate Government intervention, if it comes?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, this Government has gone on this theory: that the executive department, as such, will not project itself into the details of private negotiations between employer and employee. We do have a mediation service. When troubles arise they are called upon to assist in settling those things. But for the Government to step in and take a side, we feel is unjustifiable, and only in the case of a national emergency, I mean such a strike creating a real emergency, would the Government be justified in intervening.

Q. Mr. Hayden: The second question, sir: have your economic advisers given you any information which would give you any opinion on this issue of a guaranteed annual wage; is it a good thing, bad thing?

THE PRESIDENT. One thing that I believe I have put in one or two state of the Union messages is that I believe that the States should be encouraged and even urged to extend unemployment insurance in terms of time. I believe the maximum was weeks up until a few weeks ago when, I believe, one or two States have broken through to 30 weeks. But many, many States don't have even the 26 weeks. So I have always maintained that any process that helped to support this would be good, although I would prefer to see it through the States. But aside from that, I would express no opinion at this moment when this particular point is one of such bitter argument between two opposing groups.

Q. John Herling, Editors Syndicate: Mr. President, several weeks ago you referred to the administration's proposal on the minimum wage law, and you explained that the first part, the 90-cent minimum recommended by the administration, was not as meaningful to you as the expansion of coverage for more workers who were not at all affected by a minimum wage law. Now, may I ask, sir, does this mean that the administration specifically recommends legislation to broaden such coverage?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, didn't I say that in my state of the Union speech? I think, if I recall, in January of this year I asked the Congress to consider all of those classes that are not covered and to determine those that could profitably and properly be covered. That is the kind of extension I was talking about. I have not specifically recommended any class or group, that is, agriculture groups, retail groups, or anything else. I have not said a word about that.

Q. Mr. Herling: The confusion, I think, sir, in some minds is that the administration is specific on the 90 cents but not specific on the inclusion of those to be brought under coverage; and, therefore, there was some doubt expressed, sir, as to the interest of the administration in having such coverage made this year. Now, may I ask, sir, whether the administration specifically wants coverage this year?

THE PRESIDENT. Why, indeed, yes, so long as I--I already recommended it. Now, the 90 cents

is specific because we gave the facts and figures on which we developed that level. As I recall, since the last raise in minimum wage to 75 cents, there had been a total rise in that time in the cost of living to justify a minimum wage of something on the order of 85.6 or 86.5, and we took the 90 cents as a good leveling-off figure. That was the way we arrived at it. Now, as to the others, we said this is something which must be studied by Congress, because every single one of these groups, there are pros and cons about it, and it's going to be a very difficult business. I want the coverage extended to every area where it is feasible and a practicable thing to do.

Q. Marvin L. Arrowsmith, Associated Press: Mr. President, it was just 3 years ago tomorrow, I think, that you returned from Europe and got into politics. [Laughter] This is a rather broad question, but I wondered if you cared to say how you like the game of politics after 3 years?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, Mr. Arrowsmith, the term "politics" as such seems to be one of those words that means many things to many people. We so often use it in a derogatory sense; and I think in the general derogatory sense you can say, of course, that I do not like politics. Now, on the other hand, any man who finds himself in a position of authority where he has a very great influence in the efforts of people to work toward a peaceful world, toward international relationships that will eliminate or minimize the chances of war, all that sort of thing, of course it is a fascinating business. It is a kind of thing that would engage the interest, intense interest, of any man alive. There are in this office thousands of unique opportunities to meet especially interesting people, because the Government up here in Washington has become the center of so many things that, again, you have a very fascinating experience in meeting scientists, leaders in culture, in health, in governmental action, from all over the world. There are many things about the office and the work, the work with your associates, that are, well, let's say, at least intriguing, even if at times they are very fatiguing. But it is a wonderful experience. But the word "politics" as you use it, I think the answer to that one, would be, no, I have no great liking for that.

Q. David P. Sentner, Hearst Newspapers: Mr. President, now that the official request for an appropriation for the so-called atomic peace ship has been made to Congress, could you tell us some further details about the plan, such as how long you might expect it to be built, whether there would be any American exhibit of culture and industrial know-how outside of the atomic field, and whether you might be expected to participate in some part of its voyage.

THE PRESIDENT. I get some new ideas over here once in a while, anyway. [Laughter] I hadn't thought of that one. Now, as to its details of construction and what it will do, there are still discussions going on because, manifestly, as a thing like this develops, new ideas such as yours come along. I think we can find probably someone more entertaining to put on that ship than a man my age and background. [Laughter] It is true, as I visualize it, it will be a peaceful ship with many an exhibition really of American culture, of the arts and industry. On top of that, I would hope that it would actually carry cargo as it went around the world on unscheduled runs, be ready to pick up such cargoes it could, so that everybody could see it performing a useful service in the world, but nevertheless have all the things that you just have mentioned.

Q. Edward T. Folliard, Washington Post and Times Herald: Mr. President, Representative Joe Evins of Tennessee says he has written you a letter to this effect, that if you go to a Big Four conference that you take Senator George of Georgia along as a special assistant. He says this would be an example of unity in the American people.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, no one could have greater admiration for Senator George than I. He and I have had talks about this very subject, and I think we are in complete agreement on what should be done. I think I have explained a number of times that our conception of a Big Four conference will be, let us say, a testing of temperaments or atmosphere, a discussion of problems in general, and an attempt to determine methods and procedures that might work in the attempt to solve specific problems in the world. It will not in itself be a conference to attempt the solution of these specific problems. Therefore, it would seem to me that the time for Senators and members of the Legislature to be with you is when you come to the actual working out of the detailed problems that might result conceivably in some kind of an agreement. Therefore, you want people there that are ready to explain this to their committee members, every phase of it, all of the background and what you might call the legislative history of the agreement. When we are in this general talk, I assume that the meeting is to be very small, as small as is possible under the circumstances of the number of interpreters and just experts you have to have with you.

Q. Nat S. Finney, Buffalo Evening News: Mr. President, has the fact that these aircraft appeared over Moscow earlier than was anticipated caused any speedup in civil defense and related programs?

THE PRESIDENT. Whether or not there will be any increase in terms of budget this year, I don't know. It hasn't been brought up to me in those terms. But I do believe this: I would be hopeful that it would bring about and inspire a speedup in the enthusiasm of the average citizen to do his part in this, because I must reiterate that civil defense is largely a job that falls on each of us ourselves. We cannot be assured civil defense by any bureau or any amount of money doing the work for us because we have to do it ourselves. It's a matter of discipline, it's training, it is local work largely; and the Federal Government, at best, can get into the thing with leadership, with models, with examples, and of course in certain instances with storages of supplies and all the rest of it.

Q. Herman A Lowe, Manchester (New Hampshire) Union Leader: Mr. President, the paper took a poll among a number of top military leaders such as General Van Fleet, Admiral Denfeld, General Stratemeyer, on the question of Quemoy and Matsu, and they were almost unanimously agreed that this would not solve any problems or ease any tensions in the Far East. wondered if you would comment on it?

THE PRESIDENT. What would not ease it, those two islands?

Q. Mr. Lowe: The surrender of those two islands to the Communists.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I don't want to join in any guessing game here; and of course, these people, I think, are indulging in a little bit of a guessing game. But I personally don't see how the abandonment of those islands would help our situation any in the Far East. Now, there are people in the world, of course, that believe it would make a great difference. I don't believe it would make a great difference there.

Q. Laurence H. Burd, Chicago Tribune: Mr. President, can you tell us anything more definite about the decision of the Western Powers on the time and place of a Big Four conference? Lausanne, Switzerland, has been mentioned as one possible--

THE PRESIDENT. Well, there has been no decision reached, and I don't suppose that there can

be for some time. It is a laborious business of transferring these things back and forth between the several governments concerned. So I think place and time of meeting is yet to be determined. We have no fixed convictions, although I think we would like to have it at a reasonably early date.

Q. James B. Reston, New York Times: Going back to Mr. Arrowsmith's question about your 3 years in politics, could you recall for us, sir, what your role was in the selection of Mr. Nixon for Vice President--

THE PRESIDENT. Oh, yes.

Q. Mr. Reston:--in Chicago?

THE PRESIDENT. Surely.

Q. Mr. Reston: Was he selected as your personal selection, or was he one of a number of different persons whom you approved of, or what?

THE PRESIDENT. I would be glad to give it to you. As I have reminded you people before, my experience in politics has been a little intensive, even if short. And the first thing I knew about the President or any presidential nominee having any great influence in the vice-presidential selection was, I think, about the moment that I was nominated. I said I would not do it, I didn't know enough about the things that had been going on in the United States. I had been gone 2 years. And so I wrote down the names of five, or maybe it was six, men, younger men, that I admired, that seemed to me to have made a name for themselves. And I said, "Any one of these will be acceptable to me." And he was on the list.

Q. Mr. Reston: Mr. President, could I pursue that? Could you recall who were the five men--[laughter]--and, secondly, what I was trying to get at was what is your philosophy about the role of the nominee in the selection of the Vice President? Is it your view that the convention is sovereign, it can pick anybody it likes, or should it, in your judgment, follow the recommendation of the presidential nominee?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I would say this, Mr. Reston: it seems obvious to me that unless the man as chosen were acceptable to the presidential nominee, the presidential nominee should immediately step aside, because we have a Government in this day and time when teamwork is so important, where abrupt changes could make so much difference. If a President later is suddenly disabled or killed or dies, it would be fatal, in my opinion, if you had a tense period on, not only to introduce now a man of an entirely different philosophy of government, but he, in turn, would necessarily then get an entirely new Cabinet. I think you would have chaos for a while. So I believe if there isn't some kind of general closeness of feeling between these two, it is an impossible situation, at least the way I believe it should be run. I personally believe the Vice President of the United States should never be a nonentity. I believe he should be used. I believe he should have a very useful job. And I think that ours has. Ours has worked as hard as any man I know in this whole executive department.

Q. Edward P. Morgan, American Broadcasting Company: I may be mistaken about this, sir, but I had the impression earlier that you might not be able to go to San Francisco, and I wondered if that were a fact, what might have changed your decision, and whether it had anything to do with

preparations, your preparations, for the so-called summit meeting?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, as a matter of fact, when the invitation was first issued, I didn't know when this summit meeting might take place, and so I just returned a rather noncommittal answer, told them I would answer later. Also, the date specified first that they wanted me conflicted with another engagement I had. And then they asked me for the 18th, and it cleared up everything, and so I am going. I mean the 20th--pardon me. I should like very much to extend to this group a welcome on behalf of the people of the United States, [on] the 10th anniversary. I think that it is well that the whole country review the record of accomplishment and failure, and we kind of fix in our own minds again what are our hopes and our expectations for such a body. So I would hope to do my little part by going out there to bring us all to thinking about it a little more seriously.

Q. Walter Kerr, New York Herald Tribune: Mr. President, may we take it from your answer to a previous question that at a summit meeting you would not consider it advisable to raise specific questions such as the unification of Germany or Eastern Europe?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I don't mean to say, Mr. Kerr, they won't be raised. Of course they will. But what I mean is that I don't believe that at such a meeting you can thrash out every detail that would finally have to be worked out if you are going to have an agreed-upon plan or scheme for doing this, a plan to which our great ally, Western Germany, could agree, and all others concerned. As you know, we expect Western Germany to be one of our finest allies, and we are not going to ignore their wishes in any thing.

Merriman Smith, United Press: Thank you, Mr. President.

(115) Remarks on Acceptance of a Palestinian "Lamp of Freedom" From the United Jewish Appeal June 3, 1955

[The President spoke at a ceremony in the Rose Garden following the presentation of the lamp by William Rosenwald, General Chairman of the United Jewish Appeal.]

EL-Dl6-35 (IR)

I AM DELIGHTED, on behalf of the Allied Forces who, advancing from the west, did so much to crush Nazi tyranny, to accept this beautiful and ancient relic of Jewish civilization. I am certain that those Forces--the American forces and their Allies--were representing only what we would call the heart of freedom, the belief that all people are entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness--that where these are denied one man, they are threatened for all. And so I am sure those Forces felt that in uncovering these camps, relieving the disasters and correcting the terrible conditions under which those people were living, they were not doing it fundamentally and merely because they were Jews, or anybody else. They were unfortunate human beings, and I think the heart of America and the heart of Britain and of France and the other Western Allies responded to that kind of inspiration and were delighted to do it. It was a tremendous privilege and a great change from the killing of war to turn your armies to saving human lives and human dignity. I sincerely trust that all those people are now living in health and happiness, or at least under conditions that are those of self-respect and decency.

Thank you very much for this treasure, which is unique and I have nothing like it, I assure you.

Mr. Rosenwald's remarks follow:

As Supreme Commander, Allied Expeditionary Forces, Europe, in World War II, you led the Allied Forces to victory, threw down the gates of the concentration camps and helped to save from extermination the remnant of the once-great Jewish populations of Europe. By your sympathetic understanding of the problems involved, and by your effective action, you set a pattern of humane and helpful treatment. Your example prevailed in the American zones of occupation and served to revive and restore the newly liberated Jews of Central Europe and those who sought haven there.

As an instance of your friendly concern, on September 17, 1945, you paid a special visit to Camp Feldafing on the Day of Atonement, the first to be observed by liberated Displaced Persons. You raised the morale of the DP's when you said to them, "You are here only temporarily and you must be patient until the day comes--and it will come--when you will leave here for the places you wish to go." By your memorable prophecy you sounded the keynote for the lifesaving program of the United Jewish Appeal in the decade that followed. It is an honor therefore, to present to you, as a mark of our esteem and of our profound appreciation, this ancient lamp from the Land of the Bible bearing the following inscription:

TO DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

President of the United States of America who has kept the Lamp of Freedom burning Presented in deepest gratitude by the UNITED JEWISH APPEAL for his distinguished humanitarian service to victims of Nazi tyranny. This antique lamp from the Land of the Bible, dating from approximately 50 C.E., symbolizes twenty centuries of Jewish history in which each generation renewed its devotion to freedom's ideals.

(117) Remarks at the United States-Military Academy Alumni Luncheon, West Point, NewYork June 6, 1955

[The President spoke in the Washington Hall at 1:22pm. His opening words "General Bryan" referred to Maj. Gen. Blackshear M. Bryan, Superintendent of the Academy. Later the President referred to Brig. Gen. Chauncey L. Fenton, USA (Rtd), who was President of the West Point Association of Graduates & of the West Point Alumni Foundation.]

EL-Dl6-35 (IR)

General Bryan, my classmates, and all the sons of West Point here assembled:

I am indeed highly privileged to have these few moments to say a word to you. The hall is packed with my personal friends. My life does not have the freedom that it did once that would allow me to search each out and exchange a word as I would like to do. So, by according me this privilege, I can say God bless each one of you, I should like very much to see you and talk to you alone.

I am very mindful of the admonition we have, that we are to clear this hall early, and I am not going to be guilty of consuming too much of your time. Moreover, my next engagement is to pay my respects to the distinguished president of this association, and I hope I may conduct your good wishes to him, at the same time--General Fenton.

I think any man in this spot would search his heart in the effort to find some new way in which

he could pay a special tribute to our alma mater. I am not going to pretend that I know enough about this institution to be here in the position of a preceptor. There are people here who have devoted their lives--I heard General Bryan say he personally was on his fourth tour here--have devoted their lives to bettering this institution. And I, for one, think they have done it.

Last evening I was reading an advance copy of a book written by Colonel Reeder--I hope he will take it as a plug, too. It is a book about plebes in West Point. An old grad came to West Point on the day before the graduation parade, and three plebes were standing in their rooms, bracing as hard as they could. And the old grad said, "Don't they haze plebes around here any more?" And these plebes looked at him with some amazement considering their positions. And he said, "I do hope, when you get to be yearlings, you will really restore the plebe system." As we all know, the place isn't what it used to be, and never was. I think that is lucky for all of us.

The special tribute I would like to pay would be more about methodology, I think, than anything else. As some of you may know, my experience in my new life is short but it has been rather intensive; and I have had a very great deal of opportunity to compare standards and methods and practices--in the life I now find--with the standards and methods and practices that I knew through 40 years of service with my associates from this Academy, and others that make up the Armed Services.

We are trained to deal in facts. To be truthful. To present our case as forcefully, as eloquently, as our talents may permit. To accept the judgment handed down by our commander and to perform our duty to the very best of our ability.

We learned long ago from the examples of those leaders we admire, that bad deportment is never to be confused with strength of character. If a man is sure of himself and the integrity of the processes he has used to reach his decisions he can be strong but he can be mild.

In the life that we find outside the Armed Services there seems to be a prevalent notion that if you call enough names, if you hammer enough desks, that you are a great leader. Happily, this Academy has never subscribed to any such false belief.

Now the reason I mention this is because I find throughout this country an ever-growing respect for West Point. A few years back, I was a member of a board called by Secretary Forestal to determine whether or not the Air Force should have their own Academy, and I declined to serve as chairman because my mind was made up but I was perfectly willing to serve and cast my vote the way I thought it should be.

On that board was an eminent group of educators, presidents of colleges, deans of great schools, professors. Without exception they testified to the excellence of the education in West Point and in Annapolis. Both institutions they searched very carefully through the medium of task forces. And they were struck by this one fact. They said there seems to be a spirit prevalent in these places that makes the truth and integrity the first thing--the first standard that all students must observe. The breadth of the education here impressed them. Because there was, of course, a sort of prevalent notion in our country that if you were trained for the military, you were necessarily narrow. They commented at great length upon the type of education here, the methods used so as to produce leaders who did deal in truth, in fact, and in sound conclusion.

I think their opinions of West Point are fully borne out by a record that was communicated to me

yesterday by the Superintendent, that this institution provided more Rhodes scholarships in the next class than any other in the country. I believe there are four to go from the Academy, and there would have been more except that cadets had to compete against cadets in the final competition.

Moreover, I think it is perfectly fitting and quite wonderful that the First Captain, the man who in the military tactics is concerned for military discipline and procedures, won the highest awards from the tactical staff, and is one of those men showing not only the breadth of his own comprehension but of the education he has here received.

So I say again, if with the great spirit--the purposes--of this Academy, if we can show and continue to show through this spreading knowledge of our Academies throughout the country, we may finally convince people that leadership is something of the heart and of the head. It is not merely of a fluent and wicked tongue. I could rite examples all through our history. And I do say this: I believe that if we have found a man who has had to resort to desk-pounding, if he were a great leader, he was in spite of that habit and not because of it.

To each of you my very best wishes. I hope that in the few hours remaining before graduation, I will get to see some more of you that I have not seen. Thank you for your attention.

(118) Address at the Graduation Ceremonies, United States Military Academy, West Point, New York June 7, 1955 [The President's opening words "General Bryan" referred to Maj.Gen.Blackshear M. Bryan, Academy Superintendent.]

EL-Dl6-55 (RA)

General Bryan, members of this graduating class, West Point Alumni, ladies and gentlemen:

In the year 1915 I was one of a hundred sixty-four cadets who through four West Point years had eagerly looked forward--just as you of this class have done--to the moment of graduation. Actually we thought of it as liberation; but forty busy years have somewhat changed that youthful viewpoint.

During our Academy careers, we had, to the best of our ability, or at least to the maximum of our inclination, prepared ourselves in the lessons and the experiences of the past for a future that, we complacently felt, was predictable in pattern and design.

None among us could have realized that the world in which our fathers and we had lived was, at that moment, disappearing.

True, in Europe there was a war! But this tragic fact did not alarm us as it should have, for the Nation itself was not awake to the great threat thereby imposed on it. Wars--bloody and prolonged or one-sided and quick in their outcome--were in some countries still considered almost normal instruments for the achievement of a nation's objectives. The First World War erased all grounds for such smugness. Even our own country finally became a participant. Great European empires were destroyed. The world was confronted with human losses of staggering and unprecedented proportions.

By that war's end, over three years after our graduation, mankind had come to understand that

any war is a human disaster-and in any major war the extent of the disaster is global. None escapes its effects.

Most of my class lived to see this lesson driven home with stunning emphasis more than two decades later. A second global conflict closed, just ten years ago, with a weapon that could make of war a catastrophe approaching almost the extermination of mankind.

By the calendar, exactly forty years separates my class from this one of 1955. Yet by the changes mine has seen--in the weapons of combat and the tools of peace, in the balance of international power, in the thinking of men--there might as easily be forty as four decades separating us.

Obviously, change is inescapable in human society. Since the beginning of history, the quality of a nation has been measured by its capacity to meet and to master evolving circumstances; the capacity of a man has been gauged, in part, by his flexible adjustment to the new and novel without sacrifice of principle or abandonment of standards. But change, in the leisurely days of the past, was gradual and evolutionary; the armies of Napoleon moved across Western Europe with no more speed than those of Caesar, his predecessor by eighteen centuries.

Now, within a single generation, a natural process has become a cataclysmic rush. This should generate neither a despairing belief that the tide of events is beyond human control nor an apathetic acceptance that human ability is not equal to the immense problems newly arisen. It does mean that we must think better and faster and more wisely than ever before.

When gas warfare was first introduced in combat in World War I, the techniques necessary to adjust for use the crude protective equipment of the time were both laborious and exacting. Because of this there grew up a saying in the Army that when a gas attack was met there were only two kinds of soldiers on the battlefront--"the quick and the dead."

Of the nations of today the future will say that there were two kinds: those that were intelligent, courageous, decisive, and fireless in their support of high principle--and those that disappeared from the earth.

The true patriots of today are those who are giving their best to assure that our own country will always be found in the first of these categories.

You, who graduate today, will be servants of the civil power, committed to quick obedience. But you may someday be responsible for the lives of men--possibly the fate of a campaign. No signal from headquarters will then communicate to you the proper action. The moment will not wait on the completion of a staff study. The arena of decision will be your own mind and conscience, naked of others' counsel. To be ready for that crisis is one mission of the American soldier.

The other is vastly different. Although you are to be leaders in the profession of arms, trained for the winning of battle, you are members of a vast team, the American Nation. Its historic objectives have always been human dignity, human peace, human prosperity. These, as a public servant, you must help attain. In this, no mastery of command can substitute for an intelligent comprehension of the economic goals, the political impulses, the spiritual aspirations that move tens of millions of people. But your greatest opportunity for enduring contribution to America may well come at a council table, far removed from war.

This country now approaches a Big Four Conference. The populations of the countries to be represented at this Conference constitute only a fraction of mankind. And free nations do not claim any right to speak for others.

Therefore, this prospective meeting of the Four Powers can at best be only a beginning in a renewed effort that may last a generation. It is a task that may result in a long series of conferences. In them, this Government, meeting with others, will further extend its search for ways in which the peaceful aspirations of mankind may be advanced.

Though only a few individuals will be at those conferences to speak for America, yet in a definite sense we shall all be there-all of you, all the citizens of this great land. For the American words spoken in a world council will be of moment only if they conform to the spirit that is the true strength of our country.

Militarily and materially we are strong. More important, we are strong in the partnership of many allies. But above all, our Nation is strong in its support of principle: we espouse the cause of freedom and justice and peace for all peoples, regardless of race or flag or political ideology. Though in this strength we have reason for confidence, we likewise have need for wisdom, and the caution that wisdom enforces--at the conference table itself, in the halls of government, in every place of business and in every home in America.

By caution, I mean: a prudent guard against fatuous expectations that a world, sick with ignorance, mutual fears and hates, can be miraculously cured by a single meeting. I mean a stem determination that we shall not be reckless and witless, relaxing our posture merely because a persistent foe may assume a smiling face and a soft voice.

By wisdom, I mean: a calm awareness that strength at home, strength in allies, strength in moral position, arm us in impregnable fashion to meet every wile and stratagem that may be used against us. But I mean also a persevering resolution to explore every decent avenue toward a lasting and just peace, no matter how many and bitter our disappointments. I mean an inspired faith that men's determination and capacity to better their world will in time override their ability to destroy it; and that humanity's hunger for peace and justice is a mightier force than a few men's lust for power.

By the Preamble to the Constitution, the common defense-the first mission of the soldier--is elevated to a like rank with the loftiest objectives of men and women united in a free society. Its execution, therefore, deserves and demands the best that's in you.

Nevertheless, your entire lives may and should be as seriously devoted to leading toward peace as in preparing yourselves for the tasks of war. Almost certainly, some of you will sit at future council tables as principals or as staff advisers. Your second mission, then, will be to represent accurately the heart and purposes of America. These purposes are rooted in spiritual values.

Thus:

We are determined to preserve intact the traditions and principles which constitute what we call the American Heritage-the political, intellectual, moral truths that animate America. In this sense we must forever remember that the liberty and rights of the individual, limited only by the restriction that he infringe not upon the equal liberty and rights of others, are the cornerstone of

our national existence. Unless we remain true to all that this means in worship, in thought, in speech, in work, and in the products of our individual toil, then all else will be for naught.

We shall protect our system against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and conserve the basic methods, practices, attitudes, and governmental organisms that time has proved most profitable for the solution of our problems. For example, individual initiative, competitive enterprise, the maximum local control of government are rooted in our belief that the human individual is the basis of society and the key to growth and progress. They work! To ignore them in the solution of problems is to water down the American formula for achievement.

We strive to correct the faulty and deficient in such manner that haste for change will not waste resources and effort; that constructive evolution will not degenerate into destructive revolution.

We know we must expand aggressively the application of new scientific knowledge and new techniques to every field of human endeavor for the improvement of man's existence. War necessity made nuclear fission initially a science of destruction, but we aspire to be foremost in harnessing its mighty power for peaceful use and the betterment of human living. Finally, we seek constantly to enrich the cultural content of our daily living. We hope to fortify the spirit of all of us in a wise understanding of our country's role in this time of quick and vast change and to prepare her better to lead toward peace.

As soldiers you will live by the traditions of the Service--built in the halls and on the campus of this greatest of all academies of its kind, and on many battlefields from Bunker Hill to the Korean mountains. They are a spiritual heritage whose intact preservation must be a first concern. All the wit and knowledge you may achieve can count for little in a desperate clutch unless there burns within you the inspiration springing from great traditions.

But--you must be ruthless in a self-imposed command never to rest in the pursuit of new knowledge, in your application of it to your own duties. You will be pioneers in the search for new ways to strengthen the common defense from the platoon to the General Staff. Many times you will feel that your mistakes outnumber your triumphs. But without the yeast of pioneers, the United States Army or any other organization of men cannot escape degeneration into a ritualistic worship of the status quo.

All of us gratefully acknowledge, as our fathers before us, our dependence on the guidance of Divine Providence. But this dependence must not tempt us to evade our personal responsibility to use every one of our individual and collective talents for the better discharge of our lifetime missions.

Working and living in this spirit, you as soldiers will make yourselves and the Army a professional counterpart of the American Way--jealously conserving principle; forceful in practice; courageous and calm in present crises; steadfast and patient in the long campaign for a secure and peaceful world; stout of faith in yourselves, your Alma Mater, your country and your God.

(119) President's Press Conference June 8, 1955

[President Eisenhower's seventy-first news conference was held in the Executive Office Building from 11:02 to 11:34am, in attendance: 208.]

EL-Dl6-71 (PC)

THE PRESIDENT. Ladies and gentlemen, there is one item each in the foreign and domestic fields that I would like to call attention to. One is the invitation of the Soviet Government to Chancellor Adenauer to talk over some of their mutual problems. I think it is only a natural consequence of the developments that are taking place in Western Europe that the Soviets should issue such an invitation.

As you know, the consequence of those developments has been the establishment of the Western Republic of Germany as an independent nation, and therefore it seems to be a logical gesture on the part of the Soviets to invite them in for a talk.

Now, of course, the decision of what's to be done about the invitation is exclusively that of the Federal Government of Western Germany, Chancellor Adenauer himself. The only point I want to make is that we know Chancellor Adenauer. We have the utmost faith and confidence in him, and we know one thing, that he will stand by his allies and friends.

The item in the local scene I wanted to mention was just a report that I saw yesterday on employment. The May employment apparently hit an all-time record, although it is not the highest peak that we have ever had, the '53 peak, I believe, of 63 million. This figure was 62,700,000. But employment for May was up a million over April and unemployment was down a half a million, figures which certainly are cause for gratification. Those two items are the ones I wanted to mention

We will go to the questions.

Q. Merriman Smith, United Press: Mr. President, have you received any reply from the Russian Government on our invitation to meet in Geneva on the 18th?

THE PRESIDENT. NO, we have not.

Q. Chalmers M. Roberts, Washington Post and Times Herald: Mr. President, if I understand correctly, one of the premises of your trimming the manpower in the Army has been the idea of a ready, trained reserve. The reserve bill was sidetracked in the House recently because of a segregation rider affecting the National Guard in the States, and also an amendment which would appear to rule out the sending of such reserves to countries where we have these Status of Forces agreements. I wonder if you could tell us what plans the administration has to get this bill out, if my assumption is correct that you feel that it is vital.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, of course, I feel the reserve bill is vital, and if the House situation has gotten so difficult that they can do nothing there now, why, then, I will most urgently hope that the Senate can do something about it. I want to bring out again, I suppose it is only natural that I should speak very feelingly on anything that affects the Armed Forces of the United States. I certainly lived among them many years. This reserve bill is more essential than ever before to the security of the United States. We need trained men in every single section of this country. We acknowledge, as we look at the probable face of future warfare, if ever we must face that tragedy, we acknowledge that every hamlet and important city of the United States is likely to be on the front lines. If that is true, why do we not want someone in those front lines that is trained and ready to do something sensible and logical instead of giving way, as most of us would,

undoubtedly, to the hysteria of the moment and just light running? We have to have discipline. We have to have people that are trained as to what to expect, and respond logically. So, from the standpoint of the United States and the character of warfare, I am merely showing that over and above the old need of reinforcing active units to carry on conventional types of warfare, you need somebody every place, where each State--over and above its National Guard contingents--can have somebody there who is disciplined and ready to act and support all the police and fire prevention action that must take place locally.

Then our own National Guard units need people who have been thoroughly grounded in military training. Next, we must carry on our conflicts if we have to wage them, or our mobilizations if we have to order one, with people who haven't been off to war already one or two or three times and now are raising families. It certainly is unjust to depend for training only on the people who have already done their stint in defending our country. Finally, entirely aside from the whole question of fairness, the whole question of national security, comes the individual himself. It is these individuals who must defend the United States, and why should they not have the advantage of some prior training? Now these are the reasons for a reserve bill. Now, I am just as anxious to get this thing done as I can possibly be. In some details, the bill as was finally brought out on the floor before it was amended had changed some of the items in which I believed. But the bill, on the whole, as it came out of the committee represented a tremendous advance over anything we had ever had. I believe that we just must have it, that is what I believe. I believe it is terrifically important. You mention the question of relationship between that and the size of active forces. Of course, there is a relationship, but I say, and I assure you that in my opinion no increase in the Armed Forces, active forces, of a logical size could possibly compensate for not having a reserve. We must have it. That is the way I feel about it.

Q. Mr. Roberts: Could I ask on the specific point of the segregation amendment how you stand on that?

THE PRESIDENT. I think the record of this administration on carrying out its pledges in this whole field of segregation is a good one. We have worked hard to take the Federal responsibility in this regard, and to carry it forward so as to get real advancement. I believe, on the other hand, that it is entirely erroneous to try to get legislation of this character through tacking it on to something that is so vital to the security of the United States as the security program. The mere fact that we can't all have our ways about particular things in social progress--does that mean we don't want to defend our country? Why do we make the defense of our country dependent upon all of us getting our own ways here? Now, as I say, I think the administration's record here stands up very, very well indeed, compared with any other administration I know of. But I just don't believe that it is the place to have any kind of extraneous legislation, I care not what it is.

Q. Lloyd M. Schwartz, Fairchild Publications: Mr. President, the Senate Labor Committee yesterday voted a $1 minimum wage bill, which is 10 cents more than you recommended. Now, as I understand it, Governor Adams reportedly has told the legislative leaders on the Hill that the dollar is acceptable to the administration. I wonder if you could tell us whether you would--

THE PRESIDENT. He said what? I didn't--

Q. Mr. Schwartz: He reportedly has told legislative leaders that the 1-dollar wage bill is acceptable, and that you would sign it.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I don't know who gave you that information, because I am sure the Governor didn't tell me that. [Laughter] I think I would be interested. [Laughter]

Now, actually, my recommendations and the reasons for them were given in my annual message, and I have seen nothing to change them. I did advocate a 90-cent minimum wage with extensions in the fields where Congress could find it applicable and logical. I should like to point out again that one of the reasons given for the 90-cent was recognizing certain increases in the cost of living since the last minimum wage, the 75-cent one, was enacted. I want to point out again that since January of '53, the cost of living index has varied within 1 percent. It has been a record of stability in these last months. That stability, let me say, is not any particular favor to rich and wealthy people and to great corporations. What it is important to is the person who has to meet a monthly budget and who has to look forward to his old age, living on pensions and insurance policies. Stability of the dollar is one of the things that makes this economy continue to expand and grow and give to all of our people the confidence to which they are entitled. I do believe that the reasons given there in that state of the Union speech are still sound.

Q. James B. Reston, New York Times: Mr. President, since Chancellor Adenauer is going to be in this country, I believe, next week, are you planning to see him at that time before you go to the Big Four meeting?

THE PRESIDENT. Oh, yes. He is coming to lunch with me. I thought I had--haven't we announced that?

Mr. Hagerty: Yes, June 14th.

THE PRESIDENT. He is coming to lunch on June 14th.

Q. Charles S. von Fremd, CBS News: Mr. President, I would like to go back to the Big Four again, sir.

THE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Q. Mr. von Fremd: At West Point yesterday you said that we must have prudent caution to keep any hopes of great expectations for accomplishments from growing too large, and your Secretary of State and other leading officials in and out of the administration have voiced the same warning. The Russians for some time have indicated they didn't think that very much could be accomplished at a meeting, and I wonder, sir, if you do think there is a real chance for having accomplishments of note at the meeting at the summit.

THE PRESIDENT. I also said in that talk that we would never cease searching out any new method or avenue that might lead toward peace, and I told you people, a couple of weeks ago, that there is a great faith in the world that a talk at the summit might open up one of these new paths that we could follow logically and properly. All I have tried to say is this: let's not expect too much from the first one, but let us do hope that we have opened up a new way, a new thought, a new feeling or atmosphere in the whole business, and maybe then our work will be fruitful instead of constantly frustrating. Now, I also tried to point out, let's not expect it all at once. If we do get an encouraging feeling about this thing, then let us pursue it courageously, sincerely, and thoroughly, no matter how many years it takes. That is all I am trying to say.

Q. William H. Lawrence, New York Times: Mr. President, in connection with that last answer you gave, in seeking and searching

THE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Q. Mr. Lawrence: I wonder, sir, why is it necessary to limit in advance the deliberations of the heads of state to only 3 days instead of, say, a week? Or would you extend it if you found that the opportunities were good?

THE PRESIDENT. I think some of you people know, you might say, the constitutional limitations that are on the President in this country from going away and staying as long as he pleases. Sometimes with Congress in session, you can get the necessary bill before you that required pretty instant action, because it has taken a long time to staff it. There are numbers of reasons why the President is not as free as is a Prime Minister to go some place and stay a long time. The only thing that we tried to do when we issued the invitation was to give intimation that there was some limitation on the time the President could be absent. Now, if it takes 4 or 5 days or any other period that is reasonable and will allow me to do my work, that is still acceptable. But we don't want just to make this another propaganda mill, where, if I should leave by compulsion of my duties, then it would look like I was trying to wreck the conference. That mustn't be, don't you see?

Q. Mr. Lawrence: Yes.

THE PRESIDENT. And you must guard against it. So therefore, for the heads of state, the Big Four, so called, conference, there must be understood to be a definite time limit.

Q. Douglass Cater, Reporter Magazine: Mr. President, I wonder if you could expand your thinking on this use of the anti-segregation amendments on legislation. As I understand it, the aid-to-the-schools bill is bottled up in a Senate committee because of that same conflict, that there is an attempt to add an amendment that would prevent aid to States which permitted a continuation of segregation. Would that apply the same way you think as on national defense legislation?

THE PRESIDENT. My own feeling about legislation is a simple one. If you get an idea of real importance, a substantive subject, and you want to get it enacted into law, then I believe the Congress and I believe our people should have a right to decide upon that issue by itself, and not be clouding it with amendments that are extraneous. I am not talking about the school bill now or the reserve bill or any other. I am saying as a general proposition, why not put these things up on their own and decide them? That is my feeling and my conviction about it.

Q. John Herling, Editors Syndicate: Before Labor Secretary Mitchell left for Geneva, I believe he consulted you in regard to the Conference of the International Labor Organization which he is now attending. Yesterday the U.S. delegation split at Geneva, split on their attitude toward the subject of seating delegates from Soviet and other Communist countries in the various bodies, various sections of the International Labor Organization. And Mr. W. L. McGrath, who is the U.S. employer delegate, has sharply criticized the U.S. Government and the U.S. labor delegates for being soft on communism. Would you care to comment on the administration policy in regard to our participation in the ILO?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I can't answer your question in detail this morning. I can say that ILO is one of those organizations which we believe have been beneficial, and in which we intend, of course, to continue our membership and presence. The particular argument of which you speak has not been brought to my attention. I couldn't possibly attempt to answer it. I don't know what the criticism was. I don't know what the decisions were on, but I will try to be ready to answer it at a later date.

Q. Milton B. Freudenheim, Detroit Free Press: Mr. President, will you comment on the Ford settlement, the guaranteed wage in Detroit, as to whether it is in line with your recommendations to Governors on State unemployment compensation.

THE PRESIDENT. Of course, my recommendations to States stand for themselves. They have been made and have been made public. I would not comment on the terms of contracts as between employers and employees. I have not allowed those things to come into the White House, and refuse to do so, except when there is definitely the national good or a national emergency in question. And on top of that, similar contracts are still under negotiation. So I have nothing to say.

Q. Robert Roth, Philadelphia Bulletin: Mr. President, it was said today in a piece by the Alsop brothers that their purely social relationships with old personal friends--

THE PRESIDENT. I didn't understand. That what?

Q. Mr. Roth: that their purely social relationships with old personal friends who are employees of the National Security Council are being interfered with by orders from above. They see in this an indirect imposition of censorship. Would you comment, sir, on whether you regard this as a Government intrusion into the private affairs and the proper functioning of reporters?

THE PRESIDENT. I have a press secretary, some of you may know--[laughter]--and if there are any complaints, I think they should be lodged there first, so I can find out something about it.

Q. Sarah McClendon, El Paso Times: Mr. President, Mr. Seaborn Collins, the National Commander of the American Legion, was criticized by Mountbatten, the British Lord of the Admiralty, for speaking against communism to the British Empire Service League, and he said he was setting forth what the American Legion believed should be done to defeat communism and not what the U.S. Government thought, and he said he was not presuming to tell any other government what to do, but it seems that Mountbatten said that this was talking about politics at a veterans meeting. I wonder if you would say what you think about the fitness of veterans everywhere considering communism as an issue of aggression.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think we could talk a very long time on that, Mrs. McClendon. But I did notice in that same account that after that little difference of opinion publicly, that both Mr. Collins and Dickie Mountbatten sat down together and had a good time, and apparently there wasn't anything rancorous about the argument.

Q. William Graves, Salt Lake City Deseret News: Mr. President, at this session a bill has been introduced by Senator Bennett of Utah which would provide an 18-man commission to study dispersal of U.S. industry against possible atomic attack, and Dr. Flemming of the Office of Defense Mobilization and, I believe, Secretary Talbott of the Air Force and several others have

indicated support for this type of proposal. I wonder if you would tell us your feeling on that type of plan.

THE PRESIDENT. I haven't talked to any of my advisers on this particular point, but I would say this: we have been trying to get the interests of the United States--national industries, and so on--into the real study and concern for this matter of dispersion. So therefore, if the organization of a committee would create a greater interest, determination to do something about it, I believe we would be very glad to see it done. Let me make just one observation as we go past--the thinking on this subject. By "dispersion," you don't mean picking up a great enormous Willow Run factory or some great shoe factory and moving it out in the desert. What you do mean is this: American industry is constantly expanding; so, as it expands, do you want to continue this process of concentration at particular and critical areas which increases your vulnerability, or isn't it the part of wisdom to attempt dispersion? That is really what you mean by a dispersal of industry. Moreover, if a new plant of any kind is built making some new product, why do you crowd it in where they are possibly making engines or gears or any other thing of that kind? I think it is just a matter of the future and to get decent, proper policies to govern them.

Q. Walter Kerr, New York Herald Tribune: Mr. President, did I understand you correctly to say that it is all right with you if a summit meeting should last 3, 4, or 5 days, provided that you knew in advance when it would end?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, look. Do you suppose for one minute that if I am ready to pick up and go from any place to Timbuktu to the North Pole to do something about this question of peace, that I am going to stand on a matter of 24 hours? I am trying merely to say it must be a meeting of limited length, an agreed upon, limited length, not that rigidly done. They can say from 3 days to 5 days or 3 days to 6 days, I don't care. But I just must have, if I am to attend, must have a limited time understood.

Q. Edward J. Milne, Providence Journal: Mr. President, are you concerned about, or have you made any inquiries about the long delay in the Senate committee's action on Allen Whitfield as your appointee to the Atomic Energy Commission? That has been hanging fire now for several months.

THE PRESIDENT. As a matter of fact, I haven't looked it up lately, and I couldn't give you any answer on it this morning.

Q. Richard L. Wilson, Cowles Publications: Mr. President, what are the precise areas which might be discussed, or which might be the subject of agreement at the Big Four conference?

THE PRESIDENT. I don't think you can state them precisely. I think there are problems in the world today that have created differences on which there are different convictions expressed which are obvious to us all. We have made no great progress on most of these in late years. I think the great hope would be, what is a method, what kind of an approach can we make to these problems that might give promise of real progress? Disarmament? After all, we know this: there is something that is different in the world. After all, the Russians are inviting in Mr. Nehru to try to win over the neutralist countries. They have made an unprecedented type of visit to Yugoslavia. They have invited in Chancellor Adenauer. There is a change going on. Now, in such a changing sort of atmosphere, we may discover some way that an accommodation can be

made in which we can have full confidence, which would possibly give all of us some lightening of the burdens we are carrying.

Q. Mr. Wilson: Leaving Germany out of the question for moment, is there anything in the neutrality idea which might offer the basis for agreement?

THE PRESIDENT. You mean the neutrality for others not including West Germany?

Q. Mr. Wilson: Yes, sir.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, that one I hadn't thought of, but I see that Tito rejected it. At least, that is what I read. I don't believe I have seen an official account of it; I believe I saw in the paper that he had rejected any idea of neutrality for his country. But I would say this: I personally don't believe America is ever going to be happy as long as any people with a historical record of independence are kept enslaved by someone else, by foreign domination, specifically meaning the Eastern satellites. Now, if those people of themselves chose a neutral position instead of the position they now occupy and it were an honest neutrality, it would be a tremendous advance for them.

Q. Mr. Wilson: Sir, under those conditions, could there be any modification of our position in Germany which would match a modification of the Russian position and the satellite states?

THE PRESIDENT. Now, Mr. Wilson, make no mistake. The position of Western Germany is going to be determined by Western Germany. We have recognized them as a sovereign nation, and just as we wouldn't expect some other country to determine our policy toward neutrality, we must give to Western Germany the complete right to solve their own problems. As I have already stated, I have the utmost confidence in the belief that these people are going to act in full concord with their friends and allies.

Q. Mr. Wilson: What I was pursuing, sir, was the fact that we have forces in Germany just as the Russians have forces in the Balkan countries. I wanted to ask if there was any adjustment or modification of the disposition of those forces which might provide the basis for an agreement.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, you are bringing up now one of the substantive problems that are certain to arise: what are going to be the forces and the stations of forces all through central and western Europe? I couldn't possibly hazard a question on that in advance.

Q. William Theis, International News Service: Mr. President, we have heard on the Hill that during the preliminary discussions of the Big Four meeting, you have taken a rather strong position that you would go to any neutral country, but you did not want to go to Geneva. I wonder, for the record, if you could clear up the background on that for us, and perhaps highlight it.

THE PRESIDENT. The only thing I have heard against Geneva was, you know, it is a tremendous tourist center; and if you are going to have a meeting in the summertime, I think it gets quite difficult for the Swiss people themselves. Now, I think we should go to a country known as a neutral, like Sweden, Switzerland; and Switzerland being central and convenient, is the one that seems to be indicated. I think we did prefer Lausanne. As a matter of fact, I did, at least. But I never made this a question of "either this or else," never.

Q. Mr. Theis: I think the implication in this report was that you did not particularly want to be associated with what happened at Geneva about a year ago in the Indochina situation.

THE PRESIDENT. Actually, we were no party to that particular one, but I wouldn't--maybe you've got a--say it's a good thought there. [Laughter]

Q. William M. Blair, New York Times: Dr. Scheele, the Surgeon General, reported yesterday that the original concept of testing the Salk polio vaccine, when transferred to the commercial laboratories, failed to stand up. Now, they didn't find this out until a team of scientists made their plant-by-plant inspection. My question, sir: does the Public Health Service have an obligation to make sure that the requirements that they lay down are carried out?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, now, I guess I had better be careful, because I am not so certain about the law in the matter. But I do know that they have all agreed to meet the specifications, and therefore I think they could withdraw their license for manufacture; I don't want to be too severely criticized if I misunderstand the law in this case. What has happened here is this: the scientists met and gave their very best conclusions with respect to a certain matter. The events have proved that there was a little bit of something lacking in this, and they had to be corrected. I think that the Secretary of HEW was very wise in saying safety, caution are the words that we should think of here rather than mere haste, because mere haste could have had a lot of disastrous effects. I think the scientists themselves are all agreed as to what now must be done and they are pushing it to do it.

Q. Roscoe Drummond, New York Herald Tribune: Mr. President, in connection with Mr. Adenauer's visit to Moscow, could I ask whether from our standpoint we either object in principle or feel any special anxiety about the normalization of diplomatic relations between the West German Republic and the Soviet Union.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, yesterday in my conference with the Secretary of State this matter didn't come up. As far as I am concerned, not a bit. I think that Chancellor Adenauer is one of the great statesmen of the world, and I believe he is a perfectly sound, solid citizen, and I trust him to take care of the interests of Western Germany.

Q. Ray L. Scherer, National Broadcasting Company: Mr. President, you mentioned the Yugoslav visit of the Russians.

THE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Q. Mr. Scherer: Do you share the belief of some that this country should reappraise its military aid to Yugoslavia in view of that country's new relation to the Soviet Union?

THE PRESIDENT. As I pointed up before, this is a world of change. Everything changes, and you reappraise policies monthly, weekly, daily. Just exactly what details of these programs might now need looking at, I am not sure; but I do believe this: merely because a country is striving to be somewhat neutral from their viewpoint as they look at this struggle in the world does not lessen particularly our interest in them. Our opponents seem to show more interest, almost, in the neutrals than anybody else. Of course, they don't have to worry about the peoples allied with them. They have different methods. But they are very, very greatly concerned in these neutrals; and, of course, we should be. We do want to win them to a great conviction that the freedom of

action, the national independence, the right of people to determine their own fates, that we believe in, is the one for them to adopt.

Merriman Smith, United Press: Thank you, Mr. President.

(121) Address at the Centennial Commencement of Pennsylvania State University June 11, 1955

EL-Dl6-56(RA)

COMMENCEMENT speakers, by tradition, scan the future. They strive to predict, in general terms at least, the sort of success that awaits the graduates who properly apply themselves to their jobs and professions--and, of course, follow the advice of the speaker!

But the man who spoke at my commencement did not hint that I should be the first in a half century to receive an honorary degree here. Certainly I could not foresee, by the widest stretch of imagination, that one day the faculty and trustees of this University should consider me worthy of honorary membership in the Class of 1955 at Pennsylvania State--the Centennial Class of this most distinguished school. I am grateful for this honor and delighted by my association with this class. I am particularly grateful that my youngest brother--younger brothers being confirmed skeptics about their elders--raised no objection and in person made the presentation.

Earlier this week I joined in reunion with my own Class of 1915 at West Point. Most of us had grown gray and some of us more than a little bald; but these changes were slightly compensated, I thought, by an appearance of wisdom that we did not possess forty years ago. I am sure we all felt privileged, greatly privileged, to have lived in a day of marvels and of tremendous growth in America's stature. Although we were silent about it, I am certain that every one of us envied the men in the Class of 1955 as much for the opportunities and discoveries ahead of them as for their youth, their boundless energy, and their idealism. And in this feeling I am doubtless joined by thousands of alumni here as they applaud and congratulate you of this Class of 1955.

Of course, you men and women venture forth into a world where human nature differs little, if at all, from human nature in 1915 or in the Age of Pericles. Human relations--the art of getting along with the people who work beside you and with those who live thousands of miles away--does not change in its essence with the centuries. But the age of nuclear energy, in its industrial and economic aspects, will likely bear no more resemblance to the age of steam than a jet-powered plane to an old-fashioned box kite. Indeed, the social pattern of living may be transformed beyond recognition, for I think it can be stated almost as an axiom, demonstrated by the history of mankind that:

Out of the use of a new and great energy source, along with boundless opportunities, come new and great human problems that require new and great solutions produced by broadly informed, wisely sympathetic, spiritually inspired minds.

On this campus this morning, I had the privilege of inspecting the first atomic reactor of its kind established under university auspices. This research facility was made possible by the foresight of the trustees of this University who financed the structure and its operation. The Atomic Energy Commission provides only the fuel. In consequence, within several weeks, the atom will be at productive work here at Penn State. Here also the economic and human problems created

by this new energy will be simultaneously studied by the distinguished faculties of this institution of learning.

Nuclear energy is too new for any man to chart its limits or predict its course with accuracy. But in ten short years the curtain has been pushed aside sufficiently to afford glimpses that have aroused atomic hopes commensurate with the awful dimension of atomic fears.

The extent of the economic and industrial changes that we can anticipate is indicated by estimates that world sources of uranium potentially available contain as high as twenty times the energy of the known world reserves of coal, petroleum, and natural gas combined. But power is only one of the results of nuclear fission. Many engineers and scientists believe that radiation and radioactive isotopes may provide even greater peacetime benefit. They are already opening new horizons in medicine, agriculture, and industrial processes.

Our Nation has no desire for a monopoly on the knowledge and practice of these possibilities. We want the world to share-as we always have.

Moreover, we know that the human talents essential to the advancement of science are not restricted to this country. Throughout the free countries there are men and women of great ability who, given the opportunity, can help further to advance the frontiers of knowledge and contribute to the peace and progress of the peoples of all nations.

Progress to date in nuclear science is not, of course, exclusively an American achievement. An international cooperative effort broke the barriers and made possible man's use of atomic energy. For maximum progress in the future, we must work for a continued partnership between the world's best minds--in science, engineering, education, business, and the professions.

In recognition of these facts, I proposed before the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 8, 1953, that Governments begin then and continue to make joint contributions from their stockpiles of fissionable materials to an International Atomic Agency. Although a year later, the United Nations adopted the resolution recommending the formation of such an international agency, the Soviet Union has indicated no willingness to share any part of its nuclear stockpile with such an agency. Our offer still stands.

But we cannot wait on Soviet decisions.

Already we have made substantial progress under Congressional authority toward agreements with friendly foreign governments for participation with us in the task of forwarding peaceful atomic progress. Agreements with Turkey, Lebanon, Israel, Italy, Spain, Switzerland, Denmark, Colombia, Brazil, and the Argentine Republic have been initialed. Others are being negotiated. Now we move in further action.

We have developed two new programs that I shall submit to the Congress in the conviction that they reflect the spirit and intent of law and of the American people.

First: we propose to offer research reactors to the people of free nations who can use them effectively for the acquisition of the skills and understanding essential to peaceful atomic progress. The United States, in the spirit of partnership that moves us, will contribute half the cost. We will also furnish the acquiring nation the nuclear material needed to fuel the reactor.

Second: within prudent security considerations, we propose to make available to the peoples of such friendly nations as are prepared to invest their own funds in power reactors, access to and training in the technological processes of construction and operation for peaceful purposes.

If the technical and material resources of a single nation should not appear adequate to make effective use of a research reactor, we would support a voluntary grouping of the resources of several nations within a single region to acquire and operate it together.

Our purpose is to spark the creative and inventive skills latent in the free world, to pool them and to put them to work for the betterment of the conditions under which men must live.

The research reactors acquired under this program will be fertile seeds for progress sown in the receptive soil of the free nations. The cost to the people of the United States will be small indeed when measured against the certain returns, tangible and intangible.

The second proposal will be of immediate interest mainly to the power-short areas of the world where atomic power may be economically feasible even today. Some of the countries, however, lack the knowledge and experience needed to construct and operate a commercial power reactor. This we can share for constructive purposes with friendly countries without real risk to our national security. Such sharing is expressly contemplated by the new Atomic Energy Act.

Together, these two provisions are designed, within the limits of prudence, to clear away some of the obstacles that have impeded progress in nuclear science and to permit its peaceful application by all who propose to make it serve mankind. Here is an invitation--to scientists and engineers, to industries and governments--to pool their energies and creative talents that this great achievement of the human mind may bear the fruit of its infinite promise.

The people of the United States instinctively reject any thought that their greatest scientific achievement can be used only as a weapon. Our increasing progress in its peaceful applications is evidence of that fact.

While we build atomic-powered ships for war--because we must--we have the desire, the determination to build atomic-powered ships for peace. And build them we shall! The first atomic-powered merchant ship, at its ports of call, will be a laboratory demonstration that man can harness this unlimited energy for normal, peaceful, prosperous life.

While we design bombs that can obliterate great military objectives-because we must--we are also designing generators, channels and reservoirs of atomic energy so that man may profit from this gift which the Creator of all things has put into his hands. And build them we shall!

The two proposals I have outlined here are the gateway to a broad avenue of world progress in the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Surely those of the Russian people--who, despite their Communist overlords, still think for themselves and who still retain respect for human dignity--are moved by the same feelings as we.

I still hope earnestly that the Soviet Union may join in an international effort to harness the atom for man's good. But I have such unlimited confidence in the creativeness of free minds and in the capacity of free men that I know we will, with or without the Soviets, achieve a more abundant

life for those who join together in this historic venture.

As for the social and political problems that will accompany this development, their outlines can be foreseen but dimly. Their solution will be a task in which you men and women who graduate today will be engaged intensively, probably throughout your lives. Some questions immediately suggest themselves.

Will there prevail the deep desires shared by the vast majority of all people on the earth who want peaceful use of this and all other technical advancements? Can they defeat the designs of those few evil men who would use command of this energy for their control of human destiny? In this question are involved such vital alternatives as war and peace, armament and disarmament, death and life.

Another group of questions is of a somewhat different character. As nuclear and other technological achievements continue to mount, the normal life span will continue to climb. The hourly productivity of the worker will increase. How is the increase in leisure time and the extension in life expectancy to be spent? Will it be for the achievement of man's better aspirations or his degradation to the level of a well-fed, well-kept slave of an all-powerful state?

Indeed, merely to state that question sharply reminds us that in these days and in the years ahead the need for philosophers and theologians parallels the need for scientists and engineers.

These two questions merely hint at the enormous problems and possibilities that will confront your generation. Scores of others will present themselves in the changing picture in agriculture, industry, and the arts. The answers can be found only by broadly informed, wisely sympathetic, spiritually inspired minds, the product of general education that properly blends the practical and technical with the liberal and cultural.

In this country we emphasize both liberal and practical education. But too often it is a liberal education for one and a practical education for another. What we desperately need is an integrated liberal, practical education for the same person--for every American youth who can possibly obtain its blessings. Hand and head and heart were made to work together. They must work together. They should be educated together.

In colonial Philadelphia, there was a printer who was likewise a scientist and who was hailed the wisest man of his day--a builder of international understanding and friendship. In nineteenth century Illinois, there was a rail-splitter who was likewise a lawyer and who was hailed a champion of humanity--a builder of freedom for all men. Despite their lack of formal schooling, they were educated men. Education today can nurture for us the possibility of a thousand Franklins and a thousand Lincolns in a generation, where before we were fortunate to have one.

To gain proficiency, sometimes even world acclaim in a specialized skill or profession, knowledge and training are the principal requisites. But to understand how one skill fits into another, how one profession complements and depends on another, how all human enterprises constitute an immense, interdependent society--only education can develop that understanding.

In our modern higher education, we have, I believe, three principle difficulties. First, in its practical aspect, we simply are not providing it to sufficient numbers of young men and women.

Second, we are not as proficient as we should be in providing a broad citizenship education to those who specialize in the many technical fields.

And third, even in liberal education, we have permitted it to become too much a specialization, rather than a broad, liberating influence on the mind, the attitude, the character of all students.

What we need is general education, combining the liberal and the practical, which helps a student achieve the solid foundation of understanding--understanding of man's social institutions, of man's art and culture, and of the physical and biological and spiritual world in which he lives. It is an education which helps each individual learn how to relate one relevant fact to another; to get the total of relevant facts affecting a given situation in perspective; and to reason critically and with objectivity and moral conscience toward solutions to those situations or problems.

I repeat: this kind of education is sorely needed in this country--and throughout the world.

The peoples of this earth share today a great aspiration. They all have a common dream of lasting peace with freedom and justice. But the realization of the dream calls for many types of cooperation based upon sympathetic and thorough mutual understanding. In turn, such understanding is dependent on education that produces disciplined thinking.

Throughout the world, mutual suspicions flourish in ignorance and misunderstanding. They can be dispelled only with knowledge and wisdom.

If we are to have partners for peace, then we must first be partners in sympathetic recognition that all mankind possesses in common like aspirations and hungers, like ideals and appetites, like purposes and frailties, a like demand for economic advancement. The divisions between us are artificial and transient. Our common humanity is God-made and enduring.

I know that you who today complete your education at this great university in its centennial year recognize that truth. As you apply it to the problems you meet--as productive leaders, as American citizens, as members of the free world community-you will grow in personal stature and in your contribution to human peace, human independence, human advancement.

***Operation Alert June 15, 1955 June 17, 1955 EL-DI6-56 (RA)**

(126) Address at the Tenth Anniversary Meeting of the United Nations, San Francisco, California June 20, 1955 [Broadcast over radio and television at 3pm. The President spoke at the San Francisco Opera House. His opening words "President Van Kleffens" referred to Eelco N. van Kleffens, President of the United Nations General Assembly.]

EL-Dl6-57 (RA)

President Van Kleffens, distinguished representatives of the member nations of this great organization, ladies and gentlemen:

This, my second appearance before the United Nations, gives me, as Chief Executive of the United States, the great privilege of joining with you in commemoration of an historic date--significant, momentous, for all mankind.

I am privileged to bring you a special message from the Congress of the United States. Last week

the Congress unanimously adopted a resolution requesting me to express to all of you here, on behalf of the people of the United States, our deep desire for peace and our hope that all nations will join with us in a renewed effort for peace.

Later this week my close friend and associate, Secretary John Foster Dulles, speaking with my full confidence and concurrence, will address you on appropriate elements in the foreign policy of the United States. Because of this circumstance, it seems fitting that I, today, speak principally in terms of my country's unswerving loyalty to the United Nations and of the reasons for our tireless support of it.

A decade ago, in this city, in this building, the Charter of the United Nations was signed by its fifty founding members. Into a world, shattered and still at war but hopeful and eager for a new dawn, was born an international organization, fashioned to be the supreme instrument of world peace.

For this nation, I pay respectful tribute to you whose faith, and patience, and courage, and wisdom have brought it through ten tumultuous, frequently discouraging, sometimes terrifying--but often rewarding years. That there have been failures in attempts to solve international difficulties by the principles of the Charter, none can deny. That there have been victories, only the willfully blind can fail to see. But clear it is that without the United Nations the failures would still have been written as failures into history. And, certainly, without this organization the victories could not have been achieved; instead, they might well have been recorded as human disasters. These, the world has been spared.

So, with the birthday congratulations I bring, I reaffirm to you the support of the Government of the United States in the purposes and aims of the United Nations, and in the hopes that inspired its founders.

Today, together, we face a second decade. We face it with the accumulated experience of the first ten years, as well as with the awful knowledge of nuclear weapons and the realization that a certain and enduring peace still eludes our persistent search.

But the summer of 1955, like that one of 1945, is another season of high hope for the world. There again stirs in the hearts of men a renewed devotion to the work for the elimination of war. Each of us here is witness that never in ten years has the will of many nations seemed so resolved to wage an honest and sustained campaign for a just and lasting peace. True, none of us can produce incontestable evidence to support this feeling. Nevertheless, all of us, I think, will testify that the heartfelt longings of countless millions for abundance and justice and peace seem to be commanding, everywhere, a response from their governments. These longings have strengthened the weak, encouraged the doubtful, heartened the tired, confirmed the believing. Almost it seems that men, with souls restored, are, with faith and courage, resuming the march toward the greatest human goal.

Within a month there will be a Four Power Conference of Heads of Government. Whether or not we shall then reach the initial decisions that will start dismantling the terrible apparatus of fear and mistrust and weapons erected since the end of World War II, I do not know.

The basis for success is simply put: it is that every individual at that meeting be loyal to the spirit of the United Nations and dedicated to the principles of its Charter.

I can solemnly pledge to you here--and to all the men and women of the world who may hear or read my words--that those who represent the United States will strive to be thus loyal, thus dedicated. For us of the United States, there is no alternative, because our devotion to the United Nations Charter is the outgrowth of a faith deeply rooted in our cultural, political, spiritual traditions.

Woven into the Charter is the belief of its authors:

That man--a physical, intellectual and spiritual being--has individual rights, divinely bestowed, limited only by the obligation to avoid infringement upon the equal rights of others;

That justice, decency and liberty, in an orderly society, are concepts which have raised men above the beasts of the field: to deny any person the opportunity to live under their shelter is a crime against all humanity.

Our Republic was born, grew, stands firm today in a similar belief!

The Charter assumes:

That every people has the inherent right to the kind of government under which it chooses to live and the right to select in full freedom the individuals who conduct that government.

Hence the Charter declares:

That on every nation in possession of foreign territories, there rests the responsibility to assist the peoples of those areas in the progressive development of free political institutions so that ultimately they can validly choose for themselves their permanent political status.

Our long history as a republic manifests a self-imposed compulsion to practice these same principles.

The Charter recognizes that only those who enjoy free access to historical and current facts and information, and through objective education learn to comprehend their meanings, can successfully maintain and operate a system of self-government. Our Republic, likewise, maintains that access to knowledge and education is the right of all its citizens--and of all mankind.

Written under the shadow of war, the Charter is strong in the conviction that no nation has a right to employ force aggressively against any other. To do so, or to threaten to do so, is to defy every moral law that has guided man in his long journey from darkness toward the light. Those who wrote it clearly realized that global war has come to pose for civilization a threat of shattering destruction and a sodden existence by the survivors in a dark and broken world.

Likewise they recognized that the first responsibility of every nation is to provide for its own defense; and, in pursuance of this responsibility, it has the clear right to associate itself with other like-minded peoples for the promotion of their common security.

But they who wrote the Charter emphasized that in the formation of such associations, within the framework of the United Nations, it is incumbent upon the contracting parties to inform the world by solemn assurance, always supported by deeds, that the sole purpose is defense, devoid

of aggressive aims.

We as a nation believe these truths that are expressed in the Charter. We strive to live by them. So:

We shall always maintain a government at home that recognizes and constantly seeks to sustain for the individual those rich economic, intellectual, and spiritual opportunities to which his human rights entitle him.

In our relations with all other nations, our attitude will reflect full recognition of their sovereign and equal status. We shall deal with common problems in a spirit of partnership.

Insofar as our technical, material, and intellectual capacities permit and wherever our aid, including the peaceful use of atomic energy, may be needed and desired, we shall continue to help others achieve constantly rising economic levels. Thereby, we trust that they will have increased opportunity to attain their own cultural and spiritual aspirations.

We shall work with all others--especially through this great organization, the United Nations--so that peaceful and reasonable negotiations may replace the clash of the battlefield. In this way we can in time make unnecessary the vast armaments that--even when maintained only for security--still terrify the world with their devastating potentiality and tax unbearably the creative energies of men.

As some success in disarmament is achieved, we hope that each of the so-called great powers will contribute to the United Nations, for promoting the technical and economic progress of the less productive areas, a portion of the resultant savings in military expenditures.

An abiding faith inspired the men and women who devised the great Charter under which you work. We of the United States share that faith. We hold fast to the hope that all nations in their intercourse with others will observe those amenities of deportment, customs and treatment of other nationals as are sanctioned by tradition, by logic, and by friendly purposes.

We and a majority of all nations, I believe, are united in another hope: that every government will abstain from itself attempting, or aiding others to attempt, the coercion, infiltration, or destruction of other governments in order to gain any political or material advantage or because of differences in philosophies, religions, or ideologies.

We, with the rest of the world, know that a nation's vision of peace cannot be attained through any race in armaments. The munitions of peace are justice, honesty, mutual understanding, and respect for others.

So believing and so motivated, the United States will leave no stone unturned to work for peace. We shall reject no method however novel, that holds out any hope however faint, for a just and lasting peace.

May I recall to you the words of a great citizen of this country, Abraham Lincoln, which, though uttered in a different context, apply to the problem which the world now seeks to solve.

He said: "... The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must

think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves, and then we shall save our country."

In such a body as this, it seems fitting that we should add to Lincoln's words: "Each for himself, our country and humanity."

The object of our second decade is still peace--but a peace of such new kind that all the world will think anew and act anew.

It cannot be a mere stilling of the guns--it must be a glorious way of life. In that life the atom, dedicated once as man's slayer, will become his most productive servant. It will be a peace to inspire confidence and faith so that all peoples will be released from the fear of war. Scientists will be liberated to work always for men, never against them. Who can doubt that in the next ten years world science can so beat down the ravages of disease and the pangs of poverty that humankind will experience a new expansion of living standards and of cultural and spiritual horizons. In this new kind of peace the artist, teacher and philosopher, workman, farmer, producer, and scientist will truly work together for the common welfare.

These hopes are not new. They are as old as history. But now as we meet on this tenth anniversary in the city where was born the United Nations, we must realize that at last they are steadily and surely attainable. This is new. Our part is to rededicate ourselves to the ideals of the United Nations Charter. May we here and now renew our determination to fulfill man's ancient dream, the dream which so inspired the founders of this organization.

Thus our duty will be nobly done, and future generations will behold the United Nations and stand up to call it blessed.

May I please express to your President my grateful thanks for his invitation to address this distinguished body. To each of you my gratitude for your courteous attention. Thank you very much.

(127) Remarks to the National Association of Television and Radio Farm Directors June 21, 1955

[The President spoke in the Rose Garden. His opening words referred to Frank Atwood, President of the Association, and Ezra T. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture.]

EL-Dl6-35 (IR)

Mr. Atwood, Mr. Secretary, ladies and gentlemen:

It is a fact, of course, that I am interested in farm programs from two angles: one as a farmer and one as a governmental official. And I find my ideas don't always agree when I take the two viewpoints.

I couldn't tell you how necessary I feel it is that the whole country be accurately informed on farm problems. They are basic. It is a basic industry. The prosperity of the agricultural community is absolutely necessary to the prosperity of the nation; and vice versa we can state the same truth--that the prosperity of the nation is necessary for the prosperity of the agricultural community.

I have been very much interested, since I came here, to find the interest that there sometimes is in promoting an idea that is not exactly true. For example, we know that there has been a falling farm income over some years. There have been always the steady rising of costs, although we have succeeded for the last couple of years in keeping living costs rather stable. But there has been a squeeze on the farmer.

Now I suddenly find that many people blame the flexible price support law passed last year. And only people like you can inform the public that it has not yet gone into effect, that the 1955 crops are not yet in. So I don't see how it could have much effect on the price situation as it existed up to this moment.

As an individual farmer, I might say that I am completely disinterested. Until I get out of this job, I don't get any interest in the income and the debts of my farm. That is something that purely belongs to the fellow who is leasing it.

I do, though, believe that in such items as farm prices, and in all other items that you can learn about as you come to this Capital City, you are doing a great service when you inform the American public. There is no question about the commonsense--the logic of the decisions that will be reached by the American public when they are informed. But they must be informed, and accurately. When you have the mission of getting hold of the information, not only about the farm programs, but the things that will interest the whole farm community, you are doing a tremendously great service.

The Secretary and I and this administration approach this farm problem basically from this viewpoint: the farmer is not just a farmer, he is a citizen of the United States, first and always. He is interested in his country. His boy has to go into the Services when he is called. He has to pay his taxes for all of the roads and the schools and everything else that is done if there is Federal money involved. He has to participate in his government in every possible way.

Therefore, he must know about these things so that he can fit into his concept of the whole his own particular problem, not merely viewing it in its isolated sense: that I am getting a little squeezed this year, or there is a drought or something, so let's nave something done. He must see it in the fabric or with the background, the backdrop, of the entire picture in which his government and Nation's economy is concerned.

So I think that if we are truly going to interpret the farm problem and farm programs to the farmer, we have got to raise our sights a long way and interpret, with that particular phase of the picture, the background that is such an essential part.

I am told by the Secretary of Agriculture that this group has done a yeoman's job in this regard. For it I hope you will accept my thanks, my gratitude, and more than that my utter conviction that you are doing a truly great service to farmers and to the United States of America.

(128) Remarks to the National 4-H Conference June 21, 1955 [The President spoke in the Rose Garden at 12:30pm.] EL-Dl6-35 (IR)

I COULD USE a lot of you up on my farm right now, as you know that we are trying to get it into order and shape.

We talk about farm problems. We talk about farm products. And you have heard often of the importance of the farm economy to the entire national economy. You have heard about the importance of this crop and that crop and what it means in national income.

As I see so many young people, I am tempted to talk for just a moment about the most important crop of all in this country: yourselves.

You produce the future producers of our agricultural supplies of all kinds, and you send to the city annually some one-half of your entire personnel. These cities get their infusion of new blood from our agricultural regions. The point that I should like to make is that I believe you have more than an ordinarily good opportunity to prepare yourselves well for leadership in the future activities of our country.

As a farm individual, you are first close to the soil and from the soil must come all the things by which we live. You are a business person. You have to be a professional person if you are going to farm correctly--at least the scientists are scaring me to death about the things I don't know about my farm. And you must be a working man, you must be able to take care of the things that you do in order to produce a good cow, or calf, or a crop of corn, or wheat, or cotton--whatever. So you are gaining, in the practical way, an all-round experience of the problems of the various classifications of our citizenship, as you are gaining likewise an understanding of our whole economy and where the agricultural economy fits into it. In this whole effort I think that membership of the 4-H Clubs with their stress upon citizenship-becoming good citizens, good leaders--is probably one of the greatest products that our agricultural regions are giving us today--I am sure of it.

I wish that I could have a few minutes with each of you, to try to tell you what I believe is in front of you, not in terms of the commencement speaker, who labors in very measured, solemn tones to paint the horrible side of the future and the challenges in front of you, but just to talk a little bit about some of the things I believe maybe I have learned, and how much I envy you what is in front of you--to stop and think of the things you are going to see. It is so fascinating that we could stand here for the rest of the day talking about them. In this great and fast-changing world, you are not only going to participate, you are going to be leaders--on the farms and in the cities. You are going to influence others, and you are learning today in the best possible way through these 4-H endeavors and these 4-H Clubs how to do it well.

I think the only real thought I want to leave with you is this: I congratulate you heartily both on when you were born, what you have done, and what you are going to do.

Thank you a lot, and goodby.

(131) Remarks at the Vermont State Dairy Festival, Rutland, Vermont June 22, 1955 [The President spoke at Mountain Top Inn at 8:58am. In his opening remarks the President referred to Mrs. Mortimer R. Proctor, of Proctor, Vt., in charge of women's activities for the Bermont State Dairy Festival, who presented a corsage of red clover, the State flower of Vermont.]

EL-Dl6-36 (IR)

Governor Johnson, Senator Aiken, Senator Flanders, distinguished guests--fellow members of

the Brown Swiss Dairy Cattle Association--my fellow Americans:

Much has been said by former speakers of the honor I have done this State by coming here. Let me make one thing clear-very clear: no greater honor can come to any individual and citizen of this country than to be received in friendly fashion by a cross-section of his fellow citizens. You have honored me.

I think, first, I should like to remember my manners and thank you--each of you--as representatives of my host State for the warm reception I have had, for the beautiful presents given me. As a matter of fact, for the prestige I shall have in Pennsylvania when I can show a cow that has no other like it around there. They will come to see that farm if for no other reason than that cow.

Now I had a number of reasons for coming here. I think they can all be summed up in one word: self-education.

I don't think I know enough--ever--about the people of the United States, with whom I am privileged to meet and mingle when I go on a trip like this. Particularly, I have been denied too many opportunities to go to the northern three States of the New England group. I have long wanted to come here, and for two years I have carried it as a determination. And finally, I got the permission of Governor Adams to come--and here I am!

Now one of the first things I want to learn is where Calvin Coolidge got a certain skill that I have not acquired. He held the same position I now hold. He had a distinguished record, and held it for a long time, and he spoke so rarely that he got the nickname "Silent Cal."

My own experience in this regard is exemplified by the fact that the day before yesterday I spoke in San Francisco, and here again I am today, still talking. I find that my tongue is clattering in my ears a great deal, and I would like to know what Vermont secret he had that allowed him to avoid this particular responsibility.

There is another thing I want to learn; old as I am, there is a lesson in romance I have heard attached to Vermont--told me by that now distinguished citizen, Sherman Adams of New Hampshire.

He said there was a Vermont couple that were going to get married, but Mary thought that John ought to save a thousand dollars before they really were married. And they agreed, they thought it was a good thing. And he worked all winter long, and when June again approached, Mary thought it was a nice time to think of marriage, and she said, "How much have you saved?" Well, John looked a little bit sheepish and didn't want to confess, but after a while he said, "Thirty-five dollars." She said, "That's near enough, John." [Laughter]

Ladies and gentlemen, that is a confidence--the emotion--the idealism--that we normally associate with Vermont when we say the word "Ethan Allen."

By the way, I hear my cow came from Ethan Allen's farm. And am I glad --I think I shall call her "Mrs. Ethan Allen."

Actually, I came here just to see you--to see people. I want to know you better. There are certain

things I do know about you. I know that Americans everywhere are the same, in their longing for peace, a peace that is characterized by justice, by consideration for others, by decency above all, by its insistence on respect for the individual human being as a child of his God.

All of us want that. All of us want the institutions of America preserved. It makes no difference what party label you attach to an American, we have equal veneration for our Constitution, for the basic principles that have been so beautifully upheld in this State, so well described in that tribute to the people of this State by Calvin Coolidge, just read to you a little while ago. Those are the things America wants.

But what we must find out is: what are the methods by which we approach all of these things? What are the traits we must ourselves display and hold on to?

We know we must be determined. We know we must not sacrifice principle for mere expediency. But do we know also that the responsibility is on us to attempt to understand others as we think they should understand us? Do we even make the mistake of assuming that the rest of the world knows us, knows our peaceful intentions, knows that we want nobody else's land, nobody else's rights, that we covet nothing?

We merely want to live in peace with all the world, to trade with them, to commune with them, to learn from their cultures, as they may learn from ours. I assure you, my friends, they do not know it. Even nations we know enlightened still have much to learn about America. Indeed, every single citizen of every other State has something to learn about you.

It is probably a pity that every citizen of each State cannot visit all the others, to see the differences, to learn what we have in common, and to come back with a richer, fuller understanding of America in all its beauty, in all its dignity, in all its strength, in support of moral principle.

I think as we think on these things, in lieu of travel, we do become stronger. As we think of our neighbors, as we try to apply with him or with her the spirit of the Golden Rule, we are doing the same in a very definite sense in our relationships with all the world.

That, ladies and gentlemen, is what will strengthen America and in the long run, thoroughly practiced, will help bring peace. We will remain strong always, but always in one hand will be the olive branch held out to all who will take it in honesty and in integrity.

That is what I feel about America, in its principles, its basic hopes and aspirations.

I come to you, not only to understand you better, but to ask you only to support, always, those principles, to think of them and to expand them in your own mind into method, as to how we shall do it; and then you will always make your own contribution to the peace of the world, so that our sons may stay at home, the products of our toil may be used for our schools and our roads and our churches, and not for guns and planes and tanks and ships of war.

And now as I say goodby and go for my first chance to use that beautiful fishing rod--a product of Vermont that was given me a few moments ago I want to say only this, in terms of the greatest sincerity and honesty: if you do think on these things and devise for yourself your ideas of what should be done, if you will communicate those ideas to others, hammer out a common solution

on the anvil of debate and argument and discussion, you will be doing your full part in bringing about this age-old dream of mankind: peace on earth, goodwill toward men.

Thank you.

(133) Remarks at the State Capitol, Concord, New Hampshire June 23, 1955 [The President spoke at 4:15pm. His opening words referred to Governor Lane Dwinell, and Charles Griffin, Speaker of the House of Representatives, New Hampshire State Legislature.] I

EL-Dl6-36 (IR)

Governor Dwinell, Mr. Speaker, distinguished guests and my fellow Americans:

I wonder whether your imaginations could picture yourself the recipient of such a glowing commendation as has been heaped upon me by your Governor and by the people of this State for whom he spoke?

If your imaginations are equal to that task, then you must know something of how I feel, you must know how inadequate are words in any effort to reply effectively and truly feelingly. I can only say I am overwhelmed by your kindness.

Now, I had many reasons for coming on this trip. The simplest one of all, the one that explains it best, is merely a matter of self-education.

No man in responsible office can ever know enough about this country. He must seize opportunities to go and learn. And he finds there are spots that he has visited less than, possibly, some others. One of the great gaps in my education is that I have not visited this northern tier of the New England group as much as I should have liked.

And so I am seizing the opportunity between a speech out in California and possibly even more prolonged talking in Europe to come here to mingle with you, to learn something of what you are thinking, to gain strength from you.

There are among you many of my old comrades of the Armed Services, people who served with me in war and peace. And they will know from their courses in staff colleges, and listening to lectures, that the commander often visits his troops, and the purpose is supposed to be to inspire them to do their duty better, to carry on in better fashion, to do the work that they are sent into the field to do.

I found early in war that this whole process was reversed in my case. I went out to visit the troops so that I could come back and do my job better.

My admiration for the young American on the battlefield is unexcelled. And I have found in later times that my admiration for his counterpart in every hamlet, every city, every farm of America is exactly the same.

When I feel that I have gotten a grip on what Americans are thinking, then I am perfectly certain that I am right.

In these feeble words, I am trying to tell you the serious reason for my visit among you. There are some reasons not quite so serious in character.

In my White House staff we have a lecture every morning. The chief of the staff has one subject: New Hampshire. Most of us have had a bit of education--we have unquestionably learned something--but above all things we have had our curiosity excited. We want to find out whether the golf greens are greener, the fish are bigger, more plentiful and more cooperative, whether the hills are really as beautiful as he says, whether all of the people are as healthy and strong and completely independent and virile--well!--all of the good words that we apply to people. I expect to find every one of them here.

People often ask me what my ideas are on how long I would like a residence in 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. My own thought is: they should ask how long it is going to take Governor Adams to finish up his series of lectures on New Hampshire, because he doesn't seem to be a third of the way through them yet.

In any event, just to know you is a great honor. To have heard the words I have heard is a greater one.

I hope in the next day or two to see as much of each of you, perhaps have the great privilege of greeting some of you individually, or shaking you by the hand, talking to you, if even for a brief moment. If I do have that privilege, I assure you that it is one I shall treasure.

If I do not, I would ask you to remember that I wanted to do so. This is one of the great days of my life, marred only by the fact that Mrs. Eisenhower could not be with me, because she would have enjoyed it just as much as I.

Thank you very much.

(134) Remarks at the Belknap Lodge Picnic Grounds, Laconia, New Hampshire June 23, 1955 [The President spoke at 8:30pm.]

EL-DI6-36 (IR)

Senator Bridges, distinguished guests, my fellow Americans:

Until I heard Senator Bridges talk just now, I had thought that there was no promoter of New Hampshire in the world to equal Sherman Adams.

I now think that we should stage a contest and have it done in front of a crowd like this, and by the degree of applause we can find out who can win. But it is going to be a close race, that I assure you.

I noticed that when Senator Bridges was speaking, there were certain interruptions--[laughter]--well, you people seem to find that ridiculous, but I am a farmer now and that was a very sweet sound to me. Now that I find that beautiful calf mine, she is sweeter than ever, and she is going to make some nice noises around Gettysburg, I hope.

I am not only grateful for what I have learned of New Hampshire this evening. I am certainly grateful for the New Hampshires, because they will be the first chickens on my farm. I expect to

get all of the benefits that he talked about, of early feathers, and early eggs, and big eggs, and all the rest of it.

I am delighted to be here this evening. I am delighted to see you. To each of you, my thanks for the warmth of your welcome. Indeed, I might say now, that as I have traveled through your State this afternoon, I have seen many people along the road, in the villages, and in the towns and in the country. To you and to them, to every one who has given me a smile, or a "Hi Ike"-[mooing call]--my grateful thanks. [Laughter] Now, you see!--I think that's fine! [More laughter] After all, it's a New Hampshire talking!

Good luck to each of you. Thanks for a wonderful evening, which I have enjoyed to the full.

Goodnight.

(135) Remarks at the Lincoln High School, Lincoln, New Hampshire June 24, 1955

[The President spoke at 10:42am.]

EL-Dl6-36 (IR)

Governor Dwinell, the New Hampshire Congressional Delegation, Governor Adams, distinguished guests, my fellow Americans.

Of course I am not going to make a speech. But I am in New Hampshire and it seems fitting that I should try to express one or two thoughts as to what New Hampshire has come to mean to me.

For a long time, New Hampshire has been a source of strength and aid. We have a sturdy Congressional delegation from New Hampshire in the Congress. At the head of that delegation is a very Senior Senator whose knowledge of public life has been long dedicated to the public good. Today he, with other forward-looking Americans in Washington, is trying to hammer out through the anvil of debate and legislative processes a program which will conform to the deep-seated desire of America for peace--for peace abroad and a widely shared prosperity here at home.

Americans covet no other country's land. We covet no additional power. We need no additional prestige. We want--in a land where each man is the king of his own castle--we want mere opportunity to expand, to continue to grow, and opportunity to attain our deepest spiritual and intellectual aspirations. That is what we want. That is what a forward-looking program means. That is what your delegation, under the leadership of Senator Bridges, is seeking.

Now New Hampshire has come to mean some other things to me, because I have had Sherman Adams by my side.

Once, in the war, General Marshall and General Bradley and I happened to be talking together and the conversation turned to the qualities that we were constantly seeking in the generals that served in the Army, in order that the job of the war would be most quickly and effectively accomplished.

Now all such qualities as courage, and decisiveness, and consideration for men--everything that you would think of as a necessary quality in a general, were discussed--his tactical skill, his vast

experience, his reputation, and so on.

But finally we came down to this one thing--the first quality you must seek in a general is exactly the same quality that you must seek in any man who serves the public: selflessness.

I think that Sherman Adams in the last two years--and I must say I have long sought for an opportunity to express a little bit more accurately my feeling of indebtedness to Sherman--here, it seems to me, is the proper place to do it--for these past two years, I think that he has exhibited this quality of selflessness as much as any man I have known.

He has not sought honor for himself. He has sought, in his position, almost an anonymity, to serve his country by working with the legislators, by working with the staff that is set up in the White House, by advising me and trying to keep me from stumbling too often. He has found that last, possibly, one of his toughest problems.

In any event, I think that I could express my feelings this morning by thanking New Hampshire and the town of Lincoln for sending to me Sherman Adams, to serve as the head of the staff that, without publicity, with no credit other than that which goes with that of a conscience that recognizes duty well done, is working day by day to further all of those programs that we believe will actually promote peace in the world and prosperity--a widely shared prosperity at home.

It has been a great honor for me to come to New Hampshire. It is a greater honor for me to come to this one little spot that is so dear to the heart of my good friend, my chief of staff Sherman Adams. Thank you all. It has been fine to meet you.

(136) Remarks at Ceremonies Commemorating the Discovery of the Old Man of the Mountain, Franconia Notch, New Hampshire June 24, 1955

[The President spoke at 11:30am.]

EL-Dl6-37 (IR)

Governor Dwinell, Members of the New Hampshire Congressional delegation, distinguished guests and my fellow Americans:

Only a few moments ago, I had the first opportunity of my life to look at the Old Man of the Mountain. The natural question asked me was, "What did you think of it, Mr. President?" I answered, as anyone would in polite conversation, and said: "Remarkable. Wonderful. Interesting."

The real thought that crossed my mind was: what does the Old Man of the Mountain think of us?

He has been there through time. In his lonely vigil up at the top of that mountain--let us not try to go back to what he may have been thinking through those ages before our civilization first discovered him--150 years ago he saw great ox carts going through these roads where now we travel in an instant. He saw the fastest means of transportation--the horse. Finally he saw stage coaches. He saw only here and there a habitation, a sparsely settled wilderness.

He has seen mankind go from the sailing ship and from the horse and buggy to the jet airplane and the ability to cross the ocean in a few hours. He has seen the great sciences of radio and

television come to us. He has seen every American have, with his morning breakfast, the day's news of the world. He has seen the great electronics industry--electric lights, telephones and telegraphy, and all the things by which we live today. All of these changes have come about.

But can you believe, as he stands up there, almost in infinite majesty, that he thinks it is of great concern that we travel at a rate that multiplies the speed of our forefathers?

I believe he thinks of something deeper than that. Possibly he recalls the words with which our Forefathers started the greatest of all human documents: "When in the course of human events it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and assume among the powers of the earth that separate and equal status to which both the laws of nature and nature's God intended them, a decent respect for the opinions of mankind impel them to declare the reasons which have led to their separation. We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights. Among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

These immortal words must mean a great deal to the Old Man of the Mountain. He must contemplate them from time to time. I think we--with him--understand life. We know the instinct of self-preservation, and we know what living means to us, in our separate capacities, in our separate areas. We know what liberty is: the individual right to do as we please as long as we do not infringe upon similar rights of others.

But the pursuit of happiness--he must have noted that those writers did not create this government to give us happiness. Far better they knew than to try to define happiness for any one of us--the pursuit of happiness in liberty each according to his own desires, to the deepest aspirations of his own soul. Now, what have we done about it? Where do we find happiness? Possibly that is what he is wondering today.

We know certain things. We know we would like to be at peace. We do not want to send our boys off into the Armed Services to serve in foreign lands. We do not want to dwell in fear. We do not want to contemplate the horrible things that could happen to us in a new war.

At home we want to live comfortably. We want to be well-informed. We want to have neighbors around us that we like.

But as we pursue happiness, are we thinking only of these material things? Then how do we attain it?

If we attain money to do certain things, then we want more money. If we attain a high office, we want a higher one. If there is no higher one we would like to invent it. We always want something more.

Now, what is there more? Maybe the "more" is to try to discover what others around us find as their idea of the pursuit of happiness, what is it that mankind wants, instead of each of us separately? Can we integrate the desires, the aspirations, the hopes of our community, and then do our part to achieve that?

In so doing, I wonder whether the Old Man wouldn't approve of us more than he may at present? Because he well knows, if he has watched us, that each individual is made up of two sets of

qualities. One we call the noble: courage, readiness to sacrifice, love for our families, respect for others.

And he knows also those other qualities, of selfishness and greed and ambition, and things that set men one against the other, and nations one against the other. He recognizes the right of a group, whether it be community, or whether it be nation, to protect itself, to make certain of its own security. But certainly he must applaud every effort we make to understand others, whether it be individuals, or cities, or States or nations, to understand others as we understand ourselves, and in this way bring somewhat closer, each by his own efforts, that great dream of mankind: a peaceful world in which each of us may continue to develop.

Whether we do it through church, or through our schools, through any kind of community enterprise, through the family, through our own reading, we do not seek knowledge for itself. We do not seek acquaintanceship with the classics merely that we may quote a line from it.

We seek the knowledge and the thinking of the past that we may bring it together--here today--and help forward, each in his own little fashion, that great progress that I am certain the Old Man of the Mountain yet hopes that mankind will achieve: that objective of peace on earth, goodwill to men.

I would not for a moment leave this stand with the thought that we may have these things merely by thinking, or hoping, or wishing. But behind every effort there must be an aspiration, there must be a devotion to a cause.

If we are sufficiently devoted to the cause of peace, to the kind of progress of which I speak, we will be strong, and then we will be able to cooperate with others, because only strength can cooperate--weakness cannot cooperate, it can only beg; we will be able to cooperate and to help lead the world toward that promised goal.

So I would say our best birthday present to the Old Man of the Mountain is that we make up our minds, each in his own fashion, to do his part in bringing about that hope for mankind that the Old Man must have.

Thank you a lot. It has been a great pleasure to meet you all. Goodbye.

(139) Remarks at the Hansen Ski Jump Area, Berlin, New Hampshire June 25, 1955

[The President spoke at 10:50am. His opening words "Chairman Halvorson" referred to Alf Halvorson, Executive Secretary of the Chamber of Commerce of Berlin, N.H. Later in his remarks he referred to Mayor Aime A. Tondreau of Berlin.]

EL-Dl6-37 (IR)

Chairman Halvorson, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

I am sure you realize that a loudspeaker system and a position on this platform to speak into the microphone is a poor substitute for what I should really like to do: to go through this throng and to meet each of you, to tell you something of how I feel about this visit to New Hampshire.

I have been traveling through this lovely State for two days. Everywhere I have encountered an

obvious hospitality and a cordial welcome that have touched my heart.

I have seen your beautiful skies, your lofty mountains, your great dairy herds, and many of your other industries. It has been, for me, a tour of real education.

I have been accompanied by your State officials, and everywhere local committees have participated in ceremonies and arrangements that have made my trip all the more enjoyable.

Particularly am I indebted to Governor Dwinell and his family, to Senator Bridges, to Senator Cotton, to Congressman Merrow and Congressman Bass and their lovely wives. All of them have been giving of their time to make my visit the more instructive, the more interesting and the more enjoyable.

In fact, they are busy men, you know, and I am quite sure that they are rather glad that this meeting marks the sort of official termination of my visit in New Hampshire; because out of their sense of friendship and loyalty they are staying with me, and possibly they realize their desks are piling high with work back in Washington and back in Concord.

This particular visit this morning has been sort of a climax for all of us. I have accumulated so many gifts that I am moved to remind the chairman there is a very important one he forgot. He should have provided a truck to carry them away. But there seem to be enough cars in this cavalcade that I think we can tuck them in here and there and nothing will be left behind, I assure you.

Now, my friends, I just want to say this: never have I had a more pleasant time than I have had on these two days. It has been a unique experience to come up in these northern sections of your State, to see you people, to learn something of the countryside, and to have the chance to greet some of you face to face.

And I would like, as I leave this State, to transmit a message through you to every citizen that I can reach who has greeted me along the roadside, who has been in one of the crowds that has extended to me such a cordial welcome: I am grateful--deeply grateful.

And I tell you this: I am going to accept that invitation to come back, just as soon as possible--which means certainly as soon as I have another kind of livelihood than I now enjoy.

And I want to warn the Democratic Mayor of Berlin that the next time I come I am not going to be kept out of the city. I am going right down the middle of it; and the only way he can stop it will be to turn out the police force, because at that time I will not be accompanied by so many police of my own.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen--each of you--for coming out this morning, to give me a chance to say to you "thank you," and to greet you in this fashion. It has been a wonderful morning for me. Thank you again.

(141) Remarks at the Fawn Presentation Ceremonies, Rangeley, Maine June 27,1955

[The President spoke at 2:05pm. Candy Tibbetts, the 12 year old daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Verde Tibbetts of Rangeley, Maine, presented the month old fawn as a gift from the children of that area to the children of Washington, D.C. It was placed in the National

Zoological Park in Washington.]

EL-DI6-37 (IR)

WELL, Candy, I thank you very much, and I am sure that the children of Washington will enjoy the deer.

Now I hope the deer likes its new home, too. But it may be like a lot of other folks that go to Washington, they find out they have left a lot behind.

I am sure if I were going away from these woods, along these lovely lakes and rivers, and had to go live in Washington, I would think twice, wouldn't you? But I will take it down. Good luck to you, and thank you very much.

(142) Remarks at the Skowhegan Fairgrounds, Skowhegan, Maine June 27, 1955

[The President spoke at 4:35pm.]

EL-Dl6-38 (IR)

Governor Muskie, Senator Smith, Senator Payne, members of Maine' s Congressional delegation here present--and my Fellow Americans:

No man can receive greater acclaim than to be received in friendly fashion by a gathering of real Americans. So, from the bottom of my heart, I thank you--the Governor for his official welcome, Senator Smith for all that she has so extravagantly said about my accomplishments, and each of you for the courtesy you have paid me by coming out here today that I might say hello.

There are no thanks due me for coming to this section of the United States, for long have I felt that my education was sadly lacking, in that I did not have an intimate acquaintanceship with this region. I have satisfied a long-felt desire to come here. And incidentally, I should like to point out one thing: the Office that I hold being what it is, I did not come alone. Now there must be millions of Americans as ignorant as I was of the beauties of this region. And think of all the newspaper people, photographers, and others that now should be educating those people and possibly they will come and get the same firsthand knowledge that I had.

Now, if this does not happen, either the power of the press is not what we thought it was, or these newspaper people that travel with me haven't the proper sensibilities to appreciate beauty when they see it.

I am grateful for the warmth of the welcome I have received all along the line, from young and old, from men and women, from workers and people who seem to be on vacation. And I might say, the most touching welcome that I received was from what the guides call "midges" and I call plain black flies. I am certain that during all these years when I did not come, they have been waiting on me, because they swarmed around me with their cannibalistic tendencies, and I am sure they will probably starve until I get back here.

My friends, as much as I have found here different, in the way of your scenery and your glorious lakes and streams and woodlands and piles of timber along the road, such as I have never seen, I find the basic fact is this: Americans are Americans everywhere. In our basic beliefs, in our basic

aspirations, in our hopes for the future and for our children, we are one.

We want peace in the world. We want prosperity at home, a prosperity that is widely shared, with everybody happy in his job. We have come to realize these two aspirations are related. We cannot have prosperity without peace. And there can be no peace unless we are prosperous.

We are the world's leader--economically, productively; and because we are this, we must also take the lead in many other ways, morally and politically, in leading the free world to bind itself together in a common appreciation of these basic values: the dignity of man, his right to be free, his right to exercise all of his privileges of worship and of thought and of speech, of action and of earning. In fact, to exercise every personal privilege as long as he does not violate similar rights of others.

Now, if we are going to be bound together in these things, we must realize that we can't do that, we can't attain them all, without sacrifice. As your forefathers came into this region and built their homes, their cabins, and began to conquer the wilderness, they had to sacrifice something, they had to sacrifice the safety of the lands from which they came, they had to part from loved ones, they had to make sacrifices to give to us what we have today.

If the world is going to be bound together in a system of mutual advancement--international trade--international security--with all of us sharing in that security and in that trade, here and there we must make sacrifices.

Let us make them courageously, as our forefathers did, so that we may enjoy real and secure and permanent peace, and not merely an uneasy cessation of the firing of the guns.

We want permanent peace based upon confidence, based upon justice and decency, wherever the American government is represented. That is what we are struggling for--in every chancellery in every capital of the world, those who are our friends and those who may be hostile to us.

We are coveting nobody's property. We want to assume power and rule over no one else. We want to live a life that gives to each of us the utmost opportunity for spiritual, intellectual and material and economic development, for ourselves and for our children.

I find in my few days that I have been privileged to travel across this northern tier of the New England States, those sentiments are as widely shared and deeply felt as they are anywhere in the United States.

Indeed, may I say to you that because of this, though I come among you as a stranger, I have felt no more at home in any other town or city that I have visited in this country.

And so my real word of thanks is this: that you have let me feel that you do stand with one another shoulder to shoulder, and shoulder to shoulder with all of the other localities and States and regions of the United States--that all of us, together, may march along to that fuller life, strong, secure, but tolerant and ready to help the other fellow, as we expect him to do his part in this great venture.

Now before I leave I would like to say thanks in a little bit more intimate way. Everywhere across this State today I have encountered smiles and shouts and "Hi Ikes" and waves of the

hand--as I have met them here on this fairground.

I can't reach each of you personally with a shake of the hand. I cannot even speak to all of the citizens I saw today. But if to you, and through you, I could let each of you know how sincerely I do appreciate the warmth of your friendliness, how earnestly I want to come back--as your Governor said, no matter what my job may be--then indeed I shall be content.

And now one final word. In every audience such as this, there are literally hundreds of people who have served in the Armed Services during the period I was there--men and women. Some of them have served actively in the same theater, on the same battleground as I have.

To them I just want to say this one thing: during all those years that you were abroad, while your loved ones were suffering their fears for you, and you were encountering the dangers that finally won the war, we were upheld by a belief that we were fighting for freedom, for the rights of men as individuals, and for peace.

I believe that those aspirations--slowly and tortuously it is true, but still steadily--are marching on toward achievement; and I believe that is the thought that all of us can take with us to our beds each night and thank our God that it is true. Goodnight--goodbye--and thanks.

(143) Remarks at the Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine June 27, 1955

[The President spoke at 8:33pm.]

EL-Dl6-38 (IR)

Governor Muskie, members of the Maine delegation in Congress, the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, other distinguished visitors-and my fellow Americans:

I have been on a fine two-day visit in your State, and I am delighted that someone arranged so that as my last act in this State on this trip I could say goodbye and thank you to so many of you.

I have made a lot of new friends and had a lot of fun. I have met people old and young, men and women, all of them warmly hospitable to me. I have met a lot of your trout and one or two of your salmon. I have met midges that are the only things, so far as I know, that completely whipped me. Of course, I just call them black flies, but the guides call them "midges." I have learned a lot. I have learned a lot about the beauty of your State, about your warmheartedness. I wish that I could have stopped and spoken to every single individual that did me the great honor of coming out on the street and waiting for my cavalcade to pass, or who has--like you here--come out to a locality, to a grandstand or a fairground or to an airfield, and allowed me to say "It's so good to see you--another American."

It has been a bit of a vacation. Now I go back to work. The Secretary of State--to insure that my vacation is at an end as I get into the air--is going to give me a lecture on the way down to Washington.

I think I had better be about it, without more ado. Let me again say to each of you that all of this work is for one thing: peace on this earth, for which we all aspire.

Goodbye--good luck--it has been an inspiration to be among you. I hope that some day I can

come back when, as a speaker said today, when I have another job and am not in such a hurry. Thank you. Goodnight.

(144) Remarks on the Presentation of the Distinguished Service Medal to General Matthew Ridgeway June 28, 1955 [The President made the presentation in the Rose Garden at 11:00am.]

EL-Dl6-38 (IR)

MATT, for some forty-three years, I guess, you and I have been associates and friends in war and peace. At every stage of your career and our association together, that kind of close communion with you has been a source of real satisfaction to me. I remember the days of war where you performed so gallantly and effectively. And I remember the days of peace and the great contributions you have made. Now, as the last act of our official association together, it is a great honor to pin this on you. But I hope it means no lessening either of our friendship or of my ability to call on you when I want to talk to you about things.

CITATION TO ACCOMPANY THE AWARD OF THE DISTINGUISHED SERVICE MEDAL (THIRD OAK LEAF CLUSTER) TO GENERAL MATTHEW B. RIDGWAY

The President of the United States of America, authorized by Act of Congress July 9, 1918, has awarded the Distinguished Service Medal (Third Oak Leaf Cluster) to GENERAL MATTHEW B. RIDGWAY, UNITED STATES ARMY for exceptionally meritorious service in positions of great responsibility from 30 May 1952, to 30 June 1955:

As Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, General Ridgway was charged with the responsibility of welding an effective military structure for the defense of Western Europe. Through dynamic leadership, he furthered the development of the elements of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization into an alert, efficient, fighting team. He advanced the prestige of the Allied Forces and strengthened the bonds of friendship and cooperation among the many nations serving together in the common defense of democratic principles. In discharging this grave responsibility, he displayed indomitable spirit, inspirational application of military skills, and a sincere concern for the furtherance of the causes of freedom. As Chief of Staff of the United States Army he continually demonstrated the highest order of leadership, professional competence, astute judgment, and devotion to duty. Under his brilliant direction, the Army was maintained in a state of combat readiness, and fulfilled its world-wide commitments in a manner which contributed significantly to the advancement of the foreign policies of the United States. Ever mindful of the well-being and dignity of the individual soldier, he constantly worked to improve the welfare of the men entrusted to his care. His keen professional ability and great strength of character, displayed in his every action, have been an inspiration to the entire Army. His selfless dedication to the service of his country represents the highest form of patriotism, and merits the gratitude of not only the American people but of free peoples everywhere. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

General Ridgway's response follows:

Mr. President, for you to take time from your multiple heavy duties to make this award in the presence of my superiors, and Mrs. Ridgway and Matty, touches me very deeply.

I look back over those years, sir, with profound affection and respect of the highest order.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that in this particular time that all of history points to the harsh fact that until we are much nearer this goal of a peaceful world to which you inspiringly lead, that we must maintain this Army in which you have such an abiding faith as a strong clement in the defense of this Nation.

As I turn over my duties to the splendid officer who succeeds me, I have absolute confidence, Mr. President, that if ever our security or our liberty are threatened, that this magnificent Army of ours will valiantly play its ultimately decisive role in those defenses. I thank you from the bottom of my heart, sir.

(146) President's Press Conference June 29, 1955

[President Eisenhower's seventy-second news conference was held in the Executive Office Building from 10:31 to 11:06am, in attendance: 186.]

EL-DI6-72 (PC)

THE PRESIDENT. Ladies and gentlemen, I have only one announcement this morning. The Premier of Burma, U Nu, is visiting us in the United States, and I shall have him for lunch, following an official visit in my office. I merely want to express great gratification that he came over. The returning travelers and observers in that area have spoken of him in the most glowing terms as to ability and his leadership qualities. So I am very anxious to meet him, and we expect to have a very pleasant time this noon.

Q. Merriman Smith, United Press: Mr. President, could you tell us something of the physical arrangements for the Big Four meeting? some of the people who are going with you and, if possible, when you will leave here?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I should say I shall leave either Friday evening or possibly about Saturday noon. I do want to be in Geneva on Sunday morning at a reasonable hour, and I may, just for convenience, start on Friday night rather than Saturday noon. Now, it's been agreed that there will be a limited number of people at the conference; and except for myself and two or three, what you might call, stenographic and secretarial help from my own office, the delegation will be largely the State Department-the Secretary of State and his principal assistants.[1] I think that is about all I know about it at the moment.

[1]On July 11 the United States delegation to the Geneva Conference was announced by the White House as follows: the President; the Secretary of State; Dillon Anderson, Special Assistant to the President; Charles E. Bohlen, U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union; Robert R. Bowie, Director, Policy Planning Staff, Department of State; James C. Hagerty, Press Secretary to the President; Douglas MacArthur II, Counselor of the Department of State; Livingston T. Merchant, Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs; Herman Phleger, The Legal Adviser, Department of State; and Llewellyn E. Thompson, U.S. Ambassador to Austria.

Q. Pat Munroe, Salt Lake City Deseret News: Mr. President, we had a recent editorial which suggested that, perhaps, this Geneva Conference was a meeting at the semi-summit; and I wondered if you feel that Premier Bulganin, as head of the Soviet delegation, will be able to speak for the collective heads of the Soviet Union or if you hope that Mr. Khrushchev, Marshal Zhukov and, perhaps, some others will come along with the delegation, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, of course, you raise one of the, you might say, questions that

constitutes an existing puzzle. No one really knows who carries the dominating influence in that group. But let's remember this: there are different forms of government everywhere. Ours is one of those in which the head of the state is also head of a political party and head of a government. Now, in Britain, for example, you have a parliamentary form of government, and the head of the government is not the head of the state whatsoever. So in no case can you have, as I see it, exact counterparts from each state to be represented in a conference such as this kind, because governmental forms differ. So you would have to hope merely that the people who do have some powers of decision in their own governments will be the ones that are there. Maybe the speculation of your editorial is just as good as anybody else's on this point.

Q. Robert E. Clark, International News Service: Mr. President, you dropped several teasers in New England this last week which sounded both as if you might and might not be a candidate in 1956. Since you appear to have relaxed your own moratorium on the subject, I wonder if you can shed any fresh light on it for us.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think you are making an assumption not necessarily true. A man going off where he is trying to have a good time--if people kid him a little bit, he has got to answer in kind. [Laughter]

Q. Charles L. Bartlett, Chattanooga Times: Mr. President, one of the justifications for the Dixon-Yates contract was that the Memphis area needed the power, needed the 600,000 kilowatts. Last week, as you probably know, the Memphis City Council voted to build a steam plant of their own of about 600,000 kilowatts. I wonder if, in your opinion, the Government should now proceed with the Dixon-Yates contract or cancel it at the cheapest possible terms.

THE PRESIDENT. I haven't had this matter brought up to my attention by any of my responsible associates since I saw that suggestion in the paper. But I do know this: that when I was first visited by a delegation from Tennessee and I suggested that the city of Memphis go ahead and build their own plant, they said it was an impossibility under the whole TVA system and the TVA contract; it was an impossibility.[1] That's all I know about it.

[1]On June 30, at the direction of the President, the White House made public a letter of the same date from the Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, regarding the decision of the city of Memphis to construct its own power plant. Also released was a formal resolution adopted by the TVA Board on June 30 regarding this matter. The White House statement noted that the President had requested the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to confer promptly with the Atomic Energy Commission and the Tennessee Valley Authority to determine whether it was in the interest of the people of the area to continue or to cancel the Dixon-Yates contract.

Q. Edward T. Folliard, Washington Post and Times Herald: Mr. President, this is related to--

THE PRESIDENT. Could you speak a little louder, Mr. Folliard?

Q. Mr. Folliard: Yes. This is related to Mr. Clark's question. I wondered if Sherman Adams was going to be able to finish those ecstatic lectures on New Hampshire for the White House staff?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, he seems to be generating a very great capacity for doing it in a hurry. [Laughter]

Q. Ray L. Scherer, NBC News: Along the same line, you said several times during the tour that

the purpose of the trip was a matter of self-education.

THE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Q. Mr. Scherer: It was sort of a matter of education for newsmen, too, and some of us got educated into the notion that the people up there would like to see you stand for re-election. I was wondering what general impressions you brought back from your tour.

THE PRESIDENT. Of course, you possibly saw my friends along the roads, and we don't know who was behind in the alleys. [Laughter]

Q. Charles E. Shutt, Telenews: Mr. President, I wonder if you could tell us at this time how optimistic you are toward any positive results coming from the Geneva Conference, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I have tried to explain that. I think that the world, including ourselves, deserves a renewed opportunity now through such a meeting to attempt to discover what are the general intentions of all of us. We, trying to explain ours eloquently and intimately as we can to those who oppose us, trying to get the same impression of their intentions and purposes, through this method we may find ways of putting problems in new channels or in places and under particular studies where some real progress toward an easing of tensions, and so on, may be made.

Q. Charles von Fremd, CBS News: Mr. President, the mutual security program of the administration is running into some difficulty in the House where critics apparently believe that now that Russia is on the run, so to speak, on the defensive, that we can cut back somewhat on our foreign aid spending. Do you have any comment?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, of course, we have cut way back from the level that we once maintained. The finest statement on this whole proposition that has been made, almost, was in the report of the House Committee, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. On about page 3 or 4, as I remember, you will find a couple of paragraphs that tell about the things that have been accomplished through this program. They even went on to say that at last, finally, they have come to the place where they no longer have to ask for an explanation of what is being accomplished or what is desired, that the results are proving themselves. And then they go ahead to name, I think a half a dozen countries where great benefits to the United States have sprung from this program. And they reached the conclusion that with things going so well, with even an apparent change in the general Soviet attitude toward the world and toward us, this is no time to abandon the theory of a strong America binding to herself strong allies and helping them to be strong both internally and externally, that we should not now abandon that policy. It is a very splendid statement, and I would commend it to all of you for reading.

Q. William Theis, International News Service: Mr. President, there have been indications on the Hill that there would be introduced before this session ended some resolution expressing this Government's endorsement and hope in the future of the satellite peoples. Will you encourage or support such a move at this time?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I don't know in what words such a resolution would be couched. In fact, I haven't heard of any such purpose. I have constantly, over the past years, stated my general attitude toward this proposition, that until such states as these have a right themselves, by

their own free will, to determine their own forms of government and destiny, that there could be no real peace in the world. I am sure that is true.

Q. Robert G. Spivack, New York Post: Mr. President, do you believe that if this were a Republican-controlled Congress, that the desegregation amendment to the Reserve manpower bill would be passed?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I wouldn't even speculate on that. I don't know anything about it. All I have ever said on that is that I would like to see one bill, which is so terrifically important to the United States, be handled specifically on its own merits and without the introduction of any other kind of matter, no matter how desirable any such legislation might be in anything.

Q. Chalmers M. Roberts, Washington Post and Times Herald: Mr. President, at the UN meeting at San Francisco last week after you spoke, most of the other speakers stressed their feeling for the need of some sort of worldwide agreement on disarmament, especially in the nuclear field. You have had Harold Stassen working on this problem for some time, and I wondered if you expect that he will have for you before Geneva, or by the time you go, any formalized program that you can present there or discuss there or make public at that time?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I would say not a formalized program, Mr. Roberts. What I do believe is that through his efforts our Government and all its parts, I mean legislative leaders and the executive departments, can come together on a general type of approach to this problem, that we can then inform the American people of the general approach, and then try to make progress under that plan. In each case it would have to be a specific, probably, conference to take each item; I mean a specific step--might be the same conference--but it is going to be a very long and tortuous road to follow.

Q. Mr. Roberts: Do you expect, sir, to make public what proposals he comes up with before you begin to negotiate them at the conference?

THE PRESIDENT. I don't expect to make public anything before we have got our own minds crystallized and know that we have searched out all of the pitfalls in such discussions and such programs, and are ready to stand back of something. To do otherwise merely raises a speculation and doubt. Again, I don't know of any two people in the world that agree on this subject in its details. I have personally been studying it for, I know, 40 years, so I think we have got a pretty tough one. And the reason I have put one man and given him the sole responsibility to find the areas of agreement--out of that will come a basic principle, a basic method, that we will follow, and it will constitute the real foundation of the whole structure that we will try to build.

Q. Mrs. May Craig, Maine Papers: Mr. President, in relation to Mr. Theis' question, the House passed last week 367 to nothing a resolution of Democratic Mr. McCormack of Massachusetts, expressing sympathy with the satellites, condemning colonialism of all kinds, and asking that the United Nations and any organization in which we participated do what they could to release them. Did you favor that resolution? Did you know about that?

THE PRESIDENT. As a matter of fact, I didn't know about that. Maybe I was fishing that day, I don't know.

Q. Mrs. Craig: 367 to nothing.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I still say that there are all kinds of nuances in any such statement, possible complications, that make you very careful in uttering an official statement. For example, if you believe that, how far are you going? You are certainly not going to declare war, are you? So there instantly you fix for yourself limitations on how far we, as a people, will go in accomplishing this thing. That means, therefore, that we use peaceful means and means that are not provocative. We use moral suasion, we use refusal to be drawn into any seeming approval of such a situation; but we do place limits on ourselves instantly when we think about the thing. And so that means that there is a problem. It is not just as simple as just saying something and forgetting it.

Q. William H. Lawrence, New York Times: Is there an agreed termination date on this Big Four meeting? I rather gathered from the San Francisco dispatches that Mr. Molotov and Mr. Dulles did not agree on that point.

THE PRESIDENT. I don't know whether there has been a complete agreement. What there is, as an examination of my own duties will, I think, show to anyone, any reasonable person, is that there is some limitation on the time I may spend as far away as Geneva at a time when Congress is in session and approaching the end of the session. So we have simply stated that such-and-such a time is as long as I personally can stay in Geneva.

Q. Mr. Lawrence: And you feel, sir, that having stated that in advance, you do not run the propaganda risk of which you spoke earlier?

THE PRESIDENT. I think I don't run any risk with reasonable-minded people; I am sure of that.

Q. Sarah McClendon, El Paso Times: Sir, I believe I am right in this, that you have always taken a stand consistently against price controls, and that was in your '52 campaign and what you have done since. Now, I wonder if you feel there should be any exception in the price of gas at the wellhead?

THE PRESIDENT. Of course, you bring up a question that has been one of the most argumentative in all this field of Federal control over the natural resources of America. There is a bill in Congress now, progress is certainly being made, and here is the problem: how do you defend adequately and properly a consuming public, and how do you encourage at the same time the utmost in exploration and exploitation of the natural resources, in this case gas? One way you could kill off all exploration and raise the price of gas unconscionably would be just to stop exploring for it. So just a simple answer of saying, "We are going to control gas at 8 cents a thousand," or something like that just won't do it. So this is a complicated problem, and my feeling is this: Congress is actually making progress because they are trying to devise a bill which, at one and the same time, protects the consumer but which, at the same time, will encourage exploration. All the details of this bill I am not completely certain about because, after all, I have not had time to study it. But it seems to me that progress is being made in this complex problem.

Q. Hazel Markel, National Broadcasting Company: Mr. President, I would like to ask you, in returning to the U.N. Conference, that either by your own presence there or by the subsequent report of your Secretary of State, if you feel more or less happy and confident about the summit meetings.

THE PRESIDENT. About the--

Q. Miss Markel: About the summit meeting at Geneva.

THE PRESIDENT. Oh. You mean what I have picked up--

Q. Miss Markel: Yes. Are you confident that it is going to be successful?

THE PRESIDENT. I think this--I am trying not to expect too much, Miss Markel, but I do say this: there is obviously some change that has come about in the Soviet attitude. If that change is one that makes it easier to live with them, easier to negotiate with them, easier to solve problems that arise from day to day, then that cannot help having eventually a fine effect on the entire situation, the general situation. Now, no one believes that the great Marxian doctrine of world revolution has been abandoned by its advocates. No one believes that, and we have got, therefore, to be careful. But if we can find ways that will take some of the burdens of fear and tension off of people, we ought to explore them to the maximum. I personally believe, from what I learned in San Francisco and through my talks, that the chances for that were better than I thought they were 2 months ago.

Q. Miss Markel: Thank you, sir.

Q. Frank van der Linden, Nashville Banner: Senator Kefauver charged on the Senate floor yesterday that the Budget Bureau was trying to conceal what he called a scandal in the DixonYates contract negotiations regarding the employment of Mr. Adolphe Wenzell of the First Boston Corporation. Senator Knowland says there is no corruption in it, and that he thinks you were just trying to help the Tennessee Valley get some power. I wondered if Mr. Hughes of the Budget Bureau had cleared with you his refusal to give Mr. Kefauver the information he was asking down there?

THE PRESIDENT. Mr. Hughes came to see me, went over the situation, and I repeated to him the general instructions, I think, that I expressed once publicly in front of this body: that every single pertinent paper on the Yates-Dixon contract from its inception until the final writing of the contract would be made available, I think I said at that time, to the press, to any committee. Now, I do stand on this: nobody has a right to go in, wrecking the processes of government by taking every single file--some of you have seen our file rooms and know their size--wrecking the entire filing system and paralyzing the processes of government while they are going through them. These files are filled with every kind of personal note; I guess my own files are filled with personal notes from my own staff all through, they are honeycombed with them. To drag those things out where a man says to me, "I think so-and-so is a bad person to appoint to so-and-so, and you shouldn't have him," all he had was his own opinion. You can't drag those things out and put them before the public with justice to anybody, and we are not going to do it. But at the time that I gave those instructions, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Strauss, whoever else was involved, got together every single document that was pertinent to this thing and put it out. Now, as far as the Wenzell report, Mr. Wenzell was never called in or asked a single thing about the Yates-Dixon contract. He was brought in as a technical adviser in the very early days when none of us here knew about the bookkeeping methods of the TVA or anything else. He was brought in as a technical adviser and nothing else, and before this contract was ever even proposed.

Q. Allan W. Cromley, Daily Oklahoman: Mr. President, you said progress--

THE PRESIDENT. I said what?

Q. Mr. Cromley: A while ago you said that progress was being made in regards to gas legislation.

THE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Q. Mr. Cromley: Recently, Mr. Rayburn, after the House approval of the bill, I mean the House committee approval, said, "I think it is going to take the endorsement and power of the administration to get this bill passed and, of course, that means the President of the United States." I just wondered if that means you will endorse and support the bill, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I get many advisers, but it has not been brought up to me yet.

Q. Alan S. Emory, Watertown Times: Mr. President, on Friday the Senate passed a bill authorizing the Civil Aeronautics Administration to obligate 4 years in advance $63 million a year for Federal aid to airports. The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, which reported to you yesterday afternoon, advocated that the CAA authorize such aid at least 2 years in advance. Does this proposal for advance obligation of aid to the airports run in the face of administration fiscal policy or does this meet with your approval, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. I haven't had any study; as a matter of fact, I haven't heard of this particular proposal you bring up. I can't answer it, sorry.

Q. James B. Reston, New York Times: As I understand it, sir, there are no decisions to be taken at the Geneva meeting, and the conversation is to be fairly general. Now, I wondered, in the light of that, what your approach is to publicity at that meeting? Is it your view that the views of the various sides should be widely publicized or not?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, now, in the first place, I don't mean to say that necessarily there will be no decisions. I would not expect solutions to any problem that bothers the world to come up, but there could be decisions on how we would approach them. I would hope some of those would come about. As to publicity, I must say that that is one element--it is always, of course, a necessary element of these things--that has not yet come up for study. But I personally would hope that more than just the stereotyped, what do they call them, final communiqués which, I think, probably annoy writers as much as they do me-there would be something more than that come out.

Q. Martin S. Hayden, Detroit News: Mr. President, some of us over in this corner, sir, think that maybe you said something you didn't mean to. A minute ago you said no one doubts the axiom that the Marxian revolution has been abandoned by its advocates.

THE PRESIDENT. No, I didn't say that at all.

Q. Mr. Hayden: You mean nobody thinks it?

THE PRESIDENT. I said no one thinks for a minute that the Marxian doctrine has been abandoned by its advocates. I believe that--was that correct? [Chorus of "Yes, yes"]

Q. Paul A. Shinkman, King Features Syndicate: Mr. President, it has been suggested that you

might take the occasion of your visit to Geneva to make one or two other stops before returning home. Is that a possibility?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, there have been a number of invitations; but because of their very number it makes it, I think, almost an impossibility. Whatever time I have got over there I think I should devote to business. As you know, Europe is covered with my good friends. Nothing would give me greater satisfaction than to go into two or three of these cities. But I don't think I can do it.

Q. Milton B. Freudenheim, Akron Beacon Journal: Mr. President, Democrats in the House have been proposing and pushing a plan to finance long-range highway building by drastic increases in taxes on tires and also gasoline. Have you any comment on that, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, to this extent: first of all, I think everybody agrees that America needs roads, needs them badly, and needs them now, and they ought to be built on a coordinated, comprehensive basis, and that building ought to start. Now, the question of financing raises problems. Either you must find some way to finance these things out of current revenues as you go along, which means very greatly increased taxes, and in this case that would be on related products, gasoline, tires, and so on, or you must find some method of having a bond issue. If you had the bond issue, then you have the problem: do you want to add it to the national debt or do you want to put it under a special organization in which liquidation is provided for, and which will get this whole sum of debt off our books as rapidly as possible. The Governors of the United States, and the Clay committee which I had appointed, in cooperation developed a plan that made road building, plus a bond issue which would be liquidating, under a U.S. corporation. Now, here is one of the reasons against just raising taxes and trying to do it in that way, getting in a lot of revenue and building that much each year: where are the States going to get the money to do their part of this thing? It seems to me that we have got to recognize occasionally the very great responsibility, authority, and power that should reside in our States, allowing them to have decent sources of revenue. If we put the maximum amount that the traffic will bear on all of these things, I don't know where the States' revenue is going to come from. So we devised a plan that we thought met the needs of the situation in the best possible fashion, and I am for it now just as strongly as I was when it was devised by the Governors and by the Clay committee and put before the public.

Q. Richard Harkness, National Broadcasting Company: Mr. President, the Senate has passed a resolution, the House is scheduled to follow suit, sir, creating a bipartisan commission of 12 members to study and report on the Government's loyalty-security program. Do you see any constructive accomplishment in the report of such a committee?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, you say constructive accomplishment. I wouldn't want to answer in those terms. I say this: I have no objection. This administration has nothing to hide. It is a difficult problem. I have always maintained that I am ready to cooperate in any legitimate properly organized investigation of the Congress. Anything they do in this line, we will cooperate and do the best we can to bring to light all of the pertinent facts.

Q. Clark R. Mollenhoff, Des Moines Register and Tribune: Mr. President, a little while ago you stated that Mr. Wenzell was never called in about the Yates-Dixon contract, and there seemed to be some testimony before the SEC and before a committee that he had served as a consultant. I

wondered if you were--

THE PRESIDENT. He did serve as a consultant at one time.

Q. Mr. Mollenhoff: On the Dixon-Yates?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I think--now, I will check this up. My understanding is that quickly as the Dixon-Yates thing came up he resigned, and we got as our consultant a man named Adams from the Power Commission here itself to come over and be the consultant so as to have him, because he [Wenzell] was connected with a great Boston financial company.

Q. Mr. Mollenhoff: Mr. President, had you been informed that he had no connection at all with the Dixon-Yates?

THE PRESIDENT. My understanding of it--that part of it-there may have been an overlap of a week or two; there I am not sure.

Q. Mr. Mollenhoff: Would there be any change in your position on that if there was material that he had served as a consultant on that?

THE PRESIDENT. If he had served as a consultant on that and brought in a definite recommendation to us, I would be very delighted to make that public. But I just don't believe there is a thing in it about it. However, I will have it checked again. [Addresses Mr. Hagerty] Will you take that up? [1]

[1]A White House release, issued later in the day, stated that at no time did Adolphe Wenzell take part in any policy decisions either with regard to the inception of the proposals which led to the Dixon-Yates contract or the development of Government policy with regard to that contract.

In 1953, long before any proposal concerning the Dixon-Yates contract had been made, the release stated, Mr. Wenzell at the request of the Director of the Budget, prepared an analysis of the records and accounting systems of the Tennessee Valley Authority, particularly as to comparison of its annual report of earnings with those of similar private industry which have different requirements as to taxes, interest rates and the like. However, the release stated, one exception should be noted to keep the public record exactly straight. The one exception referred to was that from January 14 to April 3, 1954, Mr. Wenzell did serve as technical consultant to the Bureau of the Budget and in that capacity he did give advice to the Bureau of the Budget on such matters as the form of securities that might be marketable, the rate of interest that might be used, and the necessity for various protective clauses and relative costs that entered into preliminary, exploratory discussions that the Atomic Energy Commission and the Bureau of the Budget were conducting at that time. The release added that prior to the time that the definite proposal of April 10, 1954, was made--which later developed into the Dixon-rates contract--Francis L. Adams, Chief, Bureau of Power, Federal Power Commission, had been called in and was serving as Bureau of the Budget consultant; that Mr. Wenzell did not serve as consultant from April 10, 1954, and had no connection with any subsequent discussion; and that he was presently serving as Assistant to the Director of Technical Operations of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Q. Gould Lincoln, Washington Star: Mr. President, Senator Lyndon Johnson of Texas yesterday made a statement praising what the Senate had done in a legislative way, and he also said that a

certain party leader made a speech last fall saying that a cold war of partisan politics would follow the election of a Democratic Congress. He inferred that possibly that certain party later might have something to say about it. [Laughter]

THE PRESIDENT. Well, ladies and gentlemen, I said in the campaign--and I assume that his allusion to me is not so hazy that we can't take that as a--[laughter]--I said this: if you do this, how are you going to fix responsibility either for failure or success? So the very fact that he gets up and makes this statement would indicate to me that someone is confused as to where credit lies, or blame. Now, you have just given me a big chance to read a little list of legislation I want, not been passed yet. [Laughter] So if we are to get this fine cooperation now, let me read you something that I think the American people would be interested in; because I can conceive of nothing that is more important to them than to get this list: Highway construction Military reserves--for once in my life I even asked for an opportunity to go on the radio after the conclusion of that last exercise so I could tell the American people what I thought about this thing of reserves. This is vital to all of us. Why are we fooling around about it? Military survivor benefits Housing legislation Health program School construction Mutual security authorization and appropriation--I believe that is up today, and if anything should go through in a hurry that should. Refugee Act amendments--and you all know about the needs for them. Water resources--the Upper Colorado and the Frying Pan and the Cougar Dam up in the Northwest, all trying to get started and all waiting because they are not done. Customs simplification--something that is just vital to us; well maybe that is too strong a word, it is terribly important. Minimum wage and other labor bills The atomic ship Hawaiian statehood Now, I am just delighted, and I am glad to give credit for everything that has been done. I will thank everybody, personally if I can get a hold of him, that has voted for the necessary legislation. Now I want some more.

Q. John E. Kenton, New York Journal of Commerce: On the question of the atomic ship, sir, you are surely aware of some criticism that has been raised in Congress by members of both parties--

THE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Q. Mr. Kenton:--against your conception of the plan on the ground that it

THE PRESIDENT. That is right.

Q. Mr. Kenton: --it would not contribute much to real progress of the American merchant marine. In the light of the Senate vote last night, not to proceed with your conception of the atomic ship but rather with the longer-range program, wouldn't you comment on that and tell us whether you still intend to continue to fight for your version?

THE PRESIDENT. I have no doubt there are among you here people who have been serving, or have had your duties, in South American countries, Asian countries, and different European countries recently. You will find, as you were serving on those tours, that the mass of the world thinks of the atomic science as of great importance to two great power centers, Washington and the Kremlin; that it is a science that has specialized in the destruction of men, the destroying of civilization. They really shudder to think about it. What I am trying to do as one of the peace moves in this world is to convince the world, not just Russia and ourselves, but to convince the world that here is a science that can mean practically the doubling, let us say, of living standards within a reasonable space of time. Here is a great science opening up opportunities in every way.

Now, one of the ways I would like to bring this about is to have a ship going into every important port of the world, inviting people aboard; they would come by the thousands. I remember the days when the Empress of Britain used to go around advertising British goods, and I was one of the crowd that went on to see what they had. Think of the crowds that would come to see an atomic ship! And they would get the understanding that here, a ship powered by atomic energy, everything on it operating that way, with all the exhibits of what this can do in agriculture and medicine, all of the other sciences, to improve the lot of man. They would soon begin to develop and generate a moral force in this world: "Let's get this uranium turned into peaceful channels and not just in destroying men." I will tell you any way you can do it is cheap. Now, these people may differ with me as to whether it is beneficial or not. But some of them haven't differed, because one committee said "Build two ships, not one, build two." Maybe there is a difference of opinion. But I will tell you if we are going to win this war for peace, let's stop talking about cold war. We are trying to wage a war for peace; if we are going to win it, we have got to inform the world. And one of the ways to inform the world is to let them see these things that can happen with this great science. I am just sure we have got a hold of something here that can mean more to us in terms of untold billions, we will say, in terms of the lessening of tensions; and then we say, "Oh, this is a waste of money !" If we are trying to use any money through interchange of students and the Information Services, all of which I stand for and believe in implicitly, to take this and send it around as a physical demonstration of what might happen--I think we are missing a great opportunity if we don't do it. And thank you.

Q. Merriman Smith, United Press: One more.

THE PRESIDENT. I Saw him on his toes.

Q. Robert E. Clark, International News Service: Mr. President, can you tell us how you feel about the Bering Sea plane incident, and whether you agree with the Secretary of State that it was probably due to a trigger-happy Soviet pilot rather than a policy?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I am sure it was a local occurrence and not something that was directed as a matter of policy. Now, weather conditions were not good. There was a cloud cover, and there were other things in it that made it look like it was at least local, and part of it misunderstanding. It was, I think, very encouraging to note that in this incident, at least, there was a different attitude taken by the Soviets than they ever had in a similar one before.

Merriman Smith, United Press: Thank you, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT. OK.

(149) President's Press Conference July 6, 1955 [President Eisenhower's seventy-third news conference was held in the Executive Office Building from 10:30am to 12:02pm, in attendance: 180.]

EL-Dl6-73 (PC)

THE PRESIDENT. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I have no announcements; we will go right to questions.

Q. Merriman Smith, United Press: Mr. President, some of your friends in the Senate don't quite

share your feelings about a moratorium on discussing your plans for 1956. Senator Flanders, in a Fourth of July speech in Illinois, said that you cannot refuse to run in 1956. My question is, can you? [Laughter]

THE PRESIDENT. Well, for myself I don't believe that I can recall that I ever said what anyone else could or could not do; and I think that is a decision I have to reach for myself some time.

Q. Edward H. Sims, Columbia State: I have two questions, sir. Forty-nine Senators in the Senate have introduced a resolution which would direct the Tariff Commission to investigate recent textile cuts made at Geneva; and I believe you have been asked by one of those Senators, Senator Thurmond, if you would join in that agreement. I wonder if you would comment on that. The textile industry claims these cuts allow foreign producers to sell some goods below costs that they could be made in this country.

THE PRESIDENT. NO, that has not been brought to me yet. [Chorus of "Mr. President"]

Q. Mr. Sims: The other question is--thank you, sir--in the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals there is a vacancy, a judgeship vacancy, and I believe Judge Soper retired as of June 30. By custom and tradition, these judgeships have been given to the States in that circuit, I believe, for some decades. This time it is South Carolina's turn if that custom is followed. I wonder if you would say whether you intend to follow that custom.

THE PRESIDENT. That particular one hasn't been brought to me, but I will say this: in the past, we have tried in all the circuit court appointments to give the widespread representation that has been the custom in the past. Now, whether or not the facts are as stated, whether they are governing in this case, I should say I am not sure, because it has not been discussed with me.

Q. Laurence H. Burd, Chicago Tribune: Mr. President, at the summit conference does this country plan to have a stenographic record kept of the talks of the chiefs of state? And, if so, would you expect that record to be made public at some time?

THE PRESIDENT. I can't answer it. I hadn't thought of it. I would say that, for the most of these conferences, there would be stenographic reports on any official presentation by any individual. Now, if it did become just general roundtable discussion, there may not; but any formal presentation by any of the governments, I should think there would be a record kept. Now, I am guessing, and I would prefer you ask that of the Secretary of State.

Q. Charles E. Egan, New York Times: Mr. President, there is concern in some quarters that amendments and riders being added to bills up on Capitol Hill are undermining your foreign trade program as represented by the reciprocal trade. I wondered if you have any comments on that?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, any attempt, I think, to fix specific tariffs on specific items by legislation is bound to create a lot of confusion and create great difficulties both for the legislative and executive departments. Now, as far as the general practice of putting riders or extraneous matter on substantive legislation, I think my views are well known. I think every item that comes up for legislation should be handled on its own merits and not tied in with something that is irrelevant.

Q. Charles S. von Fremd, CBS News: Mr. President, many Democrats on Capitol Hill are now claiming that your decision to reopen or to restudy the Dixon-Yates matter is a political victory for their side, and claim that it represents a backing down on your part on this whole matter. Could you discuss that with us, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. I hadn't heard this particular point. The first group that ever came to my office to urge upon me the building with Federal funds of a new steam plant in the TVA were very insistent that this be done. It was the only way they could get a plant; and they said, "The city of Memphis is going to be without power in that whole region." I recommended to them that the city of Memphis build its plant just like New York City or Abilene, Kansas, would, if they had to have a plant. And they showed to me, or attempted to show to me, that this was impossible in their area because of the type of contract that TVA had made with all its customers. It is an exclusive sort of contract. If you take any power from TVA then you may not, under your contract, get any power anywhere else. That was the situation at that moment. Actually, I am delighted that the city of Memphis or any other local community, when it comes to the simple building of a power station through steamplant methods, and with no flood control or navigation or other factors in it, do it themselves. I believe we should do it ourselves. So I am not really concerned as to who is claiming political victories. This is in accordance with the philosophy in which I believe.

Q. John Herling, Editors Syndicate: Mr. President, according to yesterday's report, the administration does not now include the minimum wage in its top measures for passage this year. Would you explain, sir, why this change in signals on the part of the administration?

THE PRESIDENT. No one has changed anything that I know of.

Q. Mr. Herling: Sir, they weren't listed in the first five top measures that were indicated as required or "must" bills by the administration.

THE PRESIDENT. There were two gentlemen that I had a conference with yesterday morning, and I understand they met with the press. They named a few bills and said "and others." Now, this bill was in the "and others," I assure you

Q. Mr. Herling: Sir, a related question. [The President confers with Mr. Hagerty.]

THE PRESIDENT. I am also told that they announced it specifically when they met the press at 9:30 this morning after the meeting of the legislative leaders.

Q. Mr. Herling: Sir, this is a related question. I was not at the 9:30 meeting.

THE PRESIDENT. Oh.

Q. Mr. Herling: May I ask, sir, in view of the fact that the dollar minimum wage seems to be riding the crest now in the Senate, with both Republican and Democratic support, and in view of the changed wage pattern situation, would you be willing, would you be amenable, to the idea of signing a dollar minimum wage if it came to you?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I don't know. I never predicted, I think, that I would or would not sign a bill. I believe, as of today, that the 90-cent program is the correct one gauged by the practices

and the record of the past. Now, if we make the assumption that the 75-cent minimum wage bill was passed, that that was approximately correct, then the 90 cent by all odds is now generous. I have not yet had any economic advice that I should change my position. So, as of now, I would like to see that get a fair trial in the Congress, will they approve the 90-cent wage, and I won't predict what I will do with the other bills.

Q. William H. Lawrence, New York Times: Mr. President, returning to the Dixon-Yates question, which was raised a moment ago, have you had a report from Mr. Hughes as yet so that you could tell us whether you will or will not cancel that private agreement?

THE PRESIDENT. I had a report just a few minutes ago from Mr. Hughes. But the investigation by the Attorney General and by the Budget Bureau is still going on because there must be determined the complete feasibility of the city building its own power plant; otherwise, we might proceed quite a ways on that proposition, and find that it was an impossible thing due to some kind of legal or other limitations. The TVA has reported to me that there will be no need for this power in TVA and, of course, in that event, if that is substantiated, then there would be no need for building this plant.

Q. Mr. Lawrence: Then you would cancel under such circumstances?

THE PRESIDENT. If all of these circumstances meet the standards that we have set up, yes.

Q. Mr. Lawrence: You spoke, sir, of the continuing investigation of the feasibility of the city of Memphis--

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, and that will be--

Q. Mr. Lawrence: Is that likely to take some time, a week or 10 days ?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I didn't ask them. But my impression of this was that it might be finished up in a couple of weeks.[1]

[1]A White House release of July 12 stated that the President invited Edgar Dixon, President of the Middle South Utilities Company and the Mississippi Valley Generating Company, to meet with him that morning. The release further stated that the President expressed his appreciation to Mr. Dixon and his associates for the fine spirit and cooperation demonstrated throughout the proceedings, and praised the good will with which the company officials accepted the Government decision to terminate the so-called Dixon-Yates contract--a decision predicated on Memphis' announced plan to build its own steam generating plant and meet its own power needs.

Q. Edward T. Folliard, Washington Post and Times Herald: Mr. President, I have some questions to ask here about the strike here, the streetcar and bus strike here. Has the strike here been brought to your attention officially? Is there any suggestion that it is interfering with the operation of the Government, and have you any plans to try and bring about a settlement?

THE PRESIDENT. AS you know, all of you, it is my belief that the Federal Government, as such--the Executive portion of the Federal Government--should stay out of industrial disputes as long as it is possible, and to violate that rule only when a national emergency of some kind is obviously occurring. Now, I have got two or three remarks I would like to make. Of course, I have been kept in touch with this from the beginning. Any important strike is always discussed with me, certainly, daily. One group that hasn't received any credit, and I think we all owe them

a vote of thanks, is the police force of Washington. I have never seen any group move into an emergency, handle a strange situation, with such efficiency and unfailing good humor as they have. And I think that we owe them a vote of thanks. Now, in respect to the quarrel itself, I believe this thoroughly, particularly in public utilities: both unions and operators have a very great responsibility to the public that they serve. That public is the source of their income, and they should think about 'them and their convenience..When the governmental workers cannot get to work except by starting an hour early to walk, or because of traffic jams can't get down here, of course it is interfering to that extent with public business. I believe both sides really ought to stay in practically continuous negotiations seeking an honest answer that will be just to the public and to both sides.

Q. Charles E. Shutt, Telenews: Mr. President, Soviet Party boss Khrushchev made a couple of interesting remarks at our Embassy in Moscow on July 4th. One was that he made a point of saying the Soviets were approaching the summit conference with considerable strength, and that if we dealt honestly with them, they thought something would come out of it. The other remark he made was that if there ever was another war, he hoped that the Soviets and the Americans would be on the same side. Would you comment on that, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, with the first one, so far as I know, there is no individual in this Government that has ever said that the Russians, the Soviets, are coming to any conference weak. Of course we recognize their great military strength in the world. So that would seemingly be just thrown in for some reason of his own. So far as approaching it in good faith, we would go there with very hopeful attitudes, but that hope has got to have greater food on which to nourish itself before it can become anything like expectation. But we are going there honestly to present our case in a conciliatory, in a friendly, attitude, and we don't intend to reject anything from mere prejudice or truculence or any other lesser motive of that kind.

Q. David P. Sentner, Hearst Newspapers: Mr. President, have you received any information as to the makeup of the Russian delegation to the Big Four conference?

THE PRESIDENT. I have received none whatsoever.

Q. Sarah McClendon, El Paso Times: Sir, in the Vimon Reserve bill, he increases the amount of people who can be in the Reserve, but the bill is based on the extension, of course, of the draft, and the present Reserve bills. Several times it was mentioned there that you could increase the pool of trained people in the Reserve by merely cutting down on the time the draftees have to serve, and by increasing the take of draftees. I wonder if you have any plans to do that?

THE PRESIDENT. Not as of now, no. I am hoping for a bill somewhat on the lines of the one proposed.

Q. Anthony H. Leviero, New York Times: Mr. President, in "Operation Alert" you issued a test proclamation of martial law on a national scale. I wonder if you would discuss the application of it and where the Governors and other civil authorities would fit into the picture.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, Mr. Leviero, remember, this was an answer to a specific instance. The problem I was confronted with when I left my office and which I hadn't known before--I refused to let them tell me the conditions under which this problem was to be operated, because I conceive the played (hypothetical) decisions should be made in the proper atmosphere of

emergency--I was suddenly told that 53 of the major cities of the United States had either been destroyed or so badly damaged that the populations were fleeing; there were uncounted dead; there was great fallout over the country. Here there was, as I saw it, no recourse except to take charge instantly; because even Congress, dispersed from Washington because of a bomb, would take some hours to meet, to get together, to organize themselves. It was a terrible situation, one which you would hope would be terminated very quickly as soon as you get Congress together. Now, because of this unexpected development they handed me, I have asked the Attorney General to look through our entire record of precedents from the beginning of our Government to see what would be the thing that would do the least violence to our form of Government, which would protect the population, protect the national decision. Let's say that particular incident did at least have this benefit: to cause us to study more deeply and in a more analytical fashion our whole history to see what would be the best thing to do under such circumstances.[1]

[1]A 4-page statement was released by the White House on July 7 concerning a report made to the President on that date by the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization on the Federal agency relocation activities, which were part of a nationwide civil defense test held June 15, 16, and 17. The release included a statement concerning Director Flemming's report on the draft proclamation providing for limited martial law, which was prepared during the exercises for future study.

Q. Clark R. Mollenhoff, Des Moines Register and Tribune: Mr. President, there has been some little controversy that has arisen between Budget Director Hughes and Senator Kefauver relative to the questioning of five witnesses from the Budget Bureau in the Dixon-Yates controversy, and I wondered if you would care to discuss for us--

THE PRESIDENT. Five witnesses, you say?

Q. Mr. Mollenhoff: Five witnesses in the Dixon-Yates controversy relative to the part that Mr. Wenzell played in the Dixon-Yates case.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, Mr. Wenzell was the only one I heard about.

Q. Mr. Mollenhoff: The thing I wanted to find out was where you thought--how much discretion Mr. Hughes had?

THE PRESIDENT. I think Mr. Wenzell is entitled to tell the investigating committee exactly what he did. You will remember he was called in to investigate certain accounting and financing systems of power establishments and their tax situation. That was early in this administration, and he, I believe, submitted on that a fairly formal written report. I have no doubt he will show that written report to the committee if they want to see it, although it has no bearing on the thing they are now talking about. Later he was--for a period, I believe, of 60 days in early '54 was it?

Mr. Hagerty: A little longer.

THE PRESIDENT. Sometime, early spring of '54, he was here as a technical adviser as they were trying to devise some form of contract that would befit the situation. He, I have no doubt in all matters of fact, will testify freely before this investigating committee.

Q. Mr. Mollenhoff: Mr. President, I had in mind more the discretion that you felt your agency had had, not necessarily Mr. Wenzell, but with regard to other witnesses. There were five other witnesses in the Budget Bureau that the committee had asked to come down; and Mr. Hughes

had informed the committee that they should not--

THE PRESIDENT. Mr. Hughes has not talked to me, as I recall it. Now, maybe Mr. Hughes talked to me about it, and it slipped my mind. I have explained my attitude here time and again. If anybody in an official position of this Government does anything which is an official act, and submits it either in the form of recommendation or anything else, that is properly a matter for investigation if Congress so chooses, provided the national security is not involved. But when it comes to the conversations that take place between any responsible official and his advisers or exchange of little, mere little slips of this or that, expressing personal opinions on the most confidential basis, those are not subject to investigation by anybody; and if they are, will wreck the Government. There is no business that could be run if there would be exposed every single thought that an adviser might have, because in the process of reaching an agreed position, there are many, many conflicting opinions to be brought together. And if any commander is going to get the free, unprejudiced opinions of his subordinates, he had better protect what they have to say to him on a confidential basis. It is exactly, as I see it, like a lawyer and his client or any other confidential thing of that character.

Q. Joseph A. Dear, Capital Times: Mr. President, what is your opinion of the civil defense recommendations contained in the Report of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations?

THE PRESIDENT. I don't recall what the item was.

Q. Mr. Dear: I mention specifically the recommendation that civil defense should be the primary responsibility of the National Government rather than the States.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I will tell you this: the problem, of course, divides itself into many phases, those of (a) detecting the intentions of some foreign government; (b) detecting as quickly as possible any evidence of an impending attack against you. Now, those two things are obviously more the business of the Federal Government than anybody else or, let's say, the exclusive business. But, let's go to the other end now for a moment. How are you going to evacuate a city? It has got to be not only municipal responsibility, it has got to be personal responsibility. You can't in this country, by edict from the Federal Government, evacuate any city, because we don't move in that way. This has got to be an informed and relatively trained citizenry doing this for themselves. So it has got to be a local responsibility and a very active participation by every individual and by every responsible official in the locality, before there can be any usefulness. Now, this is true, whether it is a mere matter of evacuation or taking shelter or rescuing the wounded or protecting yourself against fallout or anything else that could happen, and it must be a very positive local participation and responsibility.

Q. Nat S. Finney, Buffalo News: Mr. President, there are two conferences at Geneva, and I don't believe you have expressed your feeling for some time about the Atoms for Peace meeting. And I wonder if you could give us your reflections as to the degree of importance you attach to that session.

THE PRESIDENT. I think it is very important. And I do think I told you how gratified I was that so many American scientists and American firms are participating in helping to make this demonstration of the United States very comprehensive, covering the whole field as far as we know it and as far as we are exploring it. I think that it should be a very beneficial thing. As you

know, we are actually erecting there one of these little swimming pool reactors.

Q. Mr. Finney: Sir, do you expect to see that during your visit? I understand that it will be ready to take a look at it.

THE PRESIDENT. I don't know whether I will get--you mean the reactor?

Q. Mr. Finney: Yes.

THE PRESIDENT. I don't know. But at Penn State I went to see an identical one because I was afraid I wouldn't get to see it any other time.

Q. Edward P. Morgan, American Broadcasting Company: I realize, sir, that this is a delicate matter coming just at this juncture before Geneva, but could you give us the benefit of your thoughts, your own personal thoughts, now on the subject of disarmament? For instance, do you feel that we, the American people, are going to have to move away somewhat from the concept of total drastic disarmament toward a sort of a standoff?

THE PRESIDENT. I wouldn't want to have anything I now say taken as authoritative, for the simple reason that the more one studies intensively this problem of disarmament, the more he finds himself in sort of a squirrel's cage. He is running around pretty rapidly, and at times he has a feeling that he is merely chasing himself. Now, when we come down to it, every kind of scheme of, let us say, leveling off, as I understand your meaning--standby, where you are now--or actually reducing, everything comes back, as I see it, to acceptable methods of enforcement. How do you enforce such things? This brings us instantly to the question of examinations, of inspections. Now, one way to approach this problem is what would. we, in the United States, suppose we took a vote of this body today or we started as a committee of the whole to study it, what kind of inspection are we ready to accept? Are we ready to open up every one of our factories, every place where something might be going on that could be inimical to the interests of somebody else? When you tackle that problem you really get into the heart of the difficulties involved, entirely aside from the political contention that there can be no easing of arguments until you ease the political tension. But the other side will say, "But that political tension is never going to ease until you take away some of the threat of these armaments." All of that is something, I believe, that could finally be resolved-- This question of inspection, what we will accept and what, therefore, we would expect others to accept, is a very serious one; consequently, there is just nothing today that I could say that is positive beyond this point. We earnestly want to find some answer to this complicated question because, to my mind, it is perfectly stupid for the world to continue to put so much in these agencies and instrumentalities that cost us so much and, if we don't have this war, do us so little good.

Q. Edward J. Milne, Providence Journal-Bulletin: Mr. President, getting back to martial law for a moment, do you suppose that when it is available, when you receive it, that you could let us have the Attorney General's report on this historical analysis?

THE PRESIDENT. I think so, because it would be something, I think, all America could understand. Now, in what form he is going to prepare his initial recommendations, I don't know; but I certainly think something could be done. This is one that should trouble us all, every one of us should think about it. It is not something merely that the Federal Government does and says: "We are right." This is a national problem.

Q. Chalmers M. Roberts, Washington Post and Times Herald: Mr. President, is the question of control that you just mentioned in relation to disarmament the type of problem that you expect to discuss at the Big Four meeting?

THE PRESIDENT. No, not any more than this: we don't intend to discuss, you know, substantive problems. But this question might come up: where would we find the best group, the best channel, or the best method in which to place this problem? That might come up, but we would not attempt to state there what kind of inspection we would be ready to accept or what kind the other side would be ready to accept. But we might say which is the best group that has a chance to come up with an answer that at least we can start studying.

Q. Mrs. May Craig, Maine Papers: Mr. President, the Republican leaders included school construction in your top priority list of measures you wanted. Would you oppose and consider as extraneous an anti-segregation amendment to that bill?

THE PRESIDENT. I would think it was extraneous, yes, for the simple reason that we need the schools. I think that the other ought to be handled on its own merits. Besides, we do have this: there apparently is plenty of law, because the Supreme Court found it to be illegal, and they have issued, as I understand it, procedural orders that will have to be carried out in due course through the district courts. Now, why do we go muddying the water? At the moment I do not quarrel with the right of Congress to pass laws on this thing; but I think they ought to do it on their own.

Q. Charles L. Bartlett, Chattanooga Times: Mr. President, on the basis of what you have been told about the role of Adolphe Wenzell in this Dixon-Yates contract, do you regard that role as proper?

THE PRESIDENT. Indeed, yes.

Q. James B. Reston, New York Times: On this disarmament question, sir, are you satisfied that it is possible, through unlimited inspection, to detect the manufacture of these weapons under modern circumstances?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, no. I think, Mr. Reston, that no one can say that through any type of inspection you could find items that have been already manufactured and concealed. Indeed, if there was peacetime work going ahead, as reactors working with even a lower grade, I think there would be no assurance that you could not convert them rapidly into war use; nor, possibly, could you be sure that they weren't actually producing a little bit of, you might say, extra, auxiliary, that was going into weapons. But I do believe this: there are lots of ways in which this thing can be approached other than just that. For example, let us take the delivery schemes. We know that when you get to long-range bombing you need very large machines and very large fields from which they take off. Now, those can be detected, and there are other ways of approaching it. We mustn't admit defeat merely because of that one fact to which you call attention.

Q. Mr. Reston: Mr. President, are the weapons themselves not getting considerably smaller so that the second point is not decisive either?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, you mean that they could be introduced into a country, other than by transport after the war starts? I think there would be some danger of that. But, on the other hand,

there is also danger to both sides because the instant one would be found, it would be practically a declaration of war against you, wouldn't it? And so there is a great risk there also.

Q. Martin Agronsky, American Broadcasting Company: Mr. President, on the second point you made of detection of long-range bombers and things like that, you responded that you thought, you were thinking about the introduction of atom weapons into another country

THE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Q. Mr. Agronsky:--and, possibly, detecting that. I think what we have in mind is the guided missile where you just need a launching platform.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, a guided missile, though, is not made in a very small factory, and when it is made I think its character can be determined instantly. You see, the trouble in this other field is you don't know what this material is being made for and it could be hidden away in very small spaces. But, I don't believe that you could take an extensive guided missile program and conceal it from any decent or effective system of inspection.

Q. Mr. Agronsky: Mr. President, would I be correct in understanding then from what you have said so far on this whole disarmament thing, and on inspection, what you come down to is the question of good faith, that you have to believe that you have arrived at a point where you can trust those because it is impossible to get adequate inspection and control?

THE PRESIDENT. Mr. Agronsky, this is just as true as you are standing there. In the long run, the kind of peace for which we are seeking, the kind of peace that will allow people to be really tranquil and confident in their daily pursuits, that will be achieved only when nations have achieved that mutual trust of which you speak. What we are up against now is an interim phase. We are trying to take a step toward that and to reduce burdens at the same time. So I should say that, knowing that none of us has that trust in the opposite side, we must search diligently for some means to lessen this danger and proceed a little ways toward the creation of that trust which must, in the long run, be the foundation of any real peace.

Q. Kenneth M. Scheibel, Gannett Newspapers: Mr. President, in view of your desire for more legislation by the Congress, do you think Congress should give up its plans to adjourn within a few weeks?

THE PRESIDENT. NO. [Laughter] I just think that Congress, when it wants to, can do an awful lot in a very short time, and I am hopeful that they will do so.

Q. James B. Reston, New York Times: Mr. President, what ever happened to that air-conditioned press room that you were thinking about? [Laughter]

THE PRESIDENT. Well, you know, I must confess when I came in this morning I was shocked. I thought we had some kind of chilling arrangements in here, and I agree we are not handling this fairly. I would be glad to ask you in my office if there were not so many of you; but I can't crowd you in there, and I have no place where I can do it.

Merriman Smith, United Press: Thank you, Mr. President.

(151) Remarks to American Field Service Students July 12, 1955 [President spoke in the

Rose Garden at 12 noon.]

EL-Dl6-38 (IR)

WELL, youngsters, it is really good to see you. Years ago I saw some of your predecessors on the steps at Columbia, I remember. We had a big morning at that time. You have just completed your year in the United States, and I am sure that you have learned a lot here, as we have learned a lot from you, because that has been the history of these expeditions.

I understand that now six hundred of our own young Americans are in your countries, sort of repaying a return call. We are delighted.

It seems a bit of fortunate coincidence that I should have an opportunity to see all of you just as I am about to depart for Geneva where, with others, we will try to explore the reasons why this world does not seem to get closer to peace, and to try to find roads that, if the world follows, all of you may live a little bit more tranquilly than have the people of my generation.

History, of course, has left us a rather tangled network of prejudices and hatreds and suspicions that are not easy to eradicate, and these are intensified by differences in ideologies-doctrinaire positions that seem to set men one against another, and make it difficult for us to live like we should like to live.

Now people don't want conflict--people in general. It is only, I think, mistaken leaders that grow too belligerent and believe that people really want to fight.

I hope that you have learned in your year here that this country does have certain basic principles--beliefs--that though not often expressed in the home and in the schools is nevertheless a very basic part of our existence.

We believe in the individual. We believe that every individual is endowed with certain rights--to worship as he pleases, to think as he pleases, to speak as he pleases, to work at the kind of profession that he himself wants.

So, if we live true to these principles, we are bound to have a government--country--that does not want to fight. Because it is one truly of the people and for the people.

And so, as we go to Geneva, trying to interpret this belief and this conviction, we are hopeful that there may be some way in which all of you can live out your lives tranquilly, helping over the years to promote the kind of understanding that you have gathered in the past year, that you will help to spread in your own countries when you go home, helping to spread the understanding that will lead to the peacefulness of your own lives and those that come after you. It is easily possible that the kind of conventions that you people have been having among yourselves, with those you have visited, and that our young Americans are having in your countries, may be far more important in the long run than the kind to which I am going.

Never forget, you have got a long time to live in this world, and so you want to make certain that you do your part with a full comprehension of the facts and with an open-minded, conciliatory attitude toward the other fellow's viewpoint. But, never sacrifice the basic principle that the human being is the important thing on this planet.

I am not sure, youngsters, why I got so serious just as I came out here to see you all, but possibly it is because I have spent so much of my life with young people--young soldiers--young people. I like them, and trust them. And honestly, my confidence in what you--this group--those like you--those that come after you--can do in this world is unbounded

Don't ever let anyone tell you you are licked. Good luck to each of you.

(153) Remarks Following the Acceptance of the Resignation of Secretary Oveta Culp Hobby July 13, 1955

[Mrs. Hobby served as the first Secretary of Health, education, and Welfare from April 11, 1953 to August 1, 1955. During World War II Mrs. Hobby was head of the Women's Army Corps with the rank of Colonel.]

EL-DI6-38 (IR)

WELL, OVETA, this is a sad day for the administration. My mind goes back to the day I first met you in London--in 1942 I suppose it was--when you came over there as head of the WAG Corps, something entirely new in my experience. But you were the first one that sold it to me, and I must say it proved itself, under your leadership, to be one of the finest organizations that the Army has ever had.

In these last two years--two years and a half--your talents have again been devoted to the service of your country, and most effectively. And I would think I could best express the feeling of the Cabinet toward you by quoting the Secretary of the Treasury--I am sure he wouldn't mind. The other day in my office, shortly after you had told me that you would have to go, I said to him that we were going to lose you. And his eyes popped open and he said, "What?--the best man in the Cabinet !"

That is the feeling that the whole Cabinet has towards you. I assure you that none of us will forget your wise counsel, your calm confidence in the face of every kind of difficulty, your concern for people everywhere, the warm heart you brought to your job as well as your talents. We are just distressed to lose you, but the best wishes of the entire executive department--indeed, I think of the Congress and all Washington that knows you--will go with you as you go back, and we will be very hopeful that you will have many fine, happy years there from here on.

[Following Mrs. Hobby's response, the President resumed speaking.]

Oveta, if I had known that you felt like that, I never would have accepted your letter of resignation.

Mrs. Secretary--I can still say that--thank you very much.

Mrs. Hobby's response to the President's remarks follows:

Thank you very much, Mr. President.

Mr. President, during the past 31 months, I have had the most singular opportunity. I have had an opportunity to serve with you, to serve a man whose entire life has been devoted to the people of the United States. I have had the most unfailing support and leadership from you in trying to

develop sound programs for the American people in the field of health, education, and welfare. And as I look back over the 31 months, Mr. President, when you came to this Office, and realize what has transpired in those 31 months, I am a very, very happy citizen.

In those 31 months we have moved away from the shadow of war; we have moved into the greatest prosperity this country has ever known, with more people working, greater wages, and being able to buy more of the good things of life.

And now perhaps we stand in the area of widest peace, and perhaps on the threshold of a universal peace. When I think of what has been accomplished in your 31 months, I feel humble and grateful to have had a part in it. When I think of the people of the United States who have had their pensions and their social security protected by a stable dollar, Mr. President--the smallest variation in the purchasing power of the dollar in 42 years--the time we have kept records; when I think of the millions of people that have been given an opportunity under social security and the hundreds of thousands that will be given an opportunity under vocational rehabilitation, and when I think of the millions of people that will benefit from your wise policies in education--in letting the people of this country think through their own education problems and bringing them up here--I feel particularly blessed.

Now, Mr. President, as you go to Geneva for all of us, I believe that every one of us will be praying that there, in that meeting, the first step will be taken toward a truly universal peace. And I for one, Mr. President, have never had such a privilege. I know this country would have been blessed at any time to have had your leadership, but in these crucial years in world affairs, I truly feel that God has had His hand on the United States in the kind of leadership you have given us.

(161)Radio and Television Address to the American People Prior to Departure for the Big Four Conference at Geneva July 15, 1955 [Delivered from the broadcast room at the White House at 8:15pm.]

EL-Dl6-58 (RA)

Good evening friends:

Within a matter of minutes I shall leave the United States on a trip that in some respects is unprecedented for a President of the United States. Other Presidents have left the continental limits of our country for the purpose of discharging their duties as Commander in Chief in time of war, or to participate in conference at the end of a war to provide for the measures that would bring about a peace. But now, for the first time, a President goes to engage in a conference with the heads of other governments in order to prevent wars, in order to see whether in this time of stress and strain we cannot devise measures that will keep from us this terrible scourge that afflicts mankind. Now, manifestly, there are many difficulties in the way of a President going abroad for a period, particularly while Congress is in session. He has many constitutional duties; he must be here to perform them. I am able to go on this trip only because of the generous cooperation of the political leaders in Congress of both political parties who have arranged their work so that my absence for a period will not interfere with the business of the Government. On my part I promised them that by a week from Sunday, on July 24th, I shall be back here ready to carry on my accustomed duties. Now it is manifest that in such a period as I am able to spend abroad, we cannot settle the details of the many problems that afflict the world. But of course I

go for a very serious purpose. This purpose is to attempt with my colleagues to change the spirit that has characterized the intergovernmental relationships of the world within the past ten years. Now--let us think for a moment about this purpose. Let us just enumerate a few of the problems that plague the world; the problem of armaments and the burdens that people are forced to carry because of the necessity for these armaments; the problem of the captive states, once proud people that are not allowed their own form of government--freely chosen by themselves and under individuals freely elected by themselves; the problem of divided countries, people who are related to each other by blood, kinship and who are divided by force of arms into two camps that are indeed expected to be hostile to each other. Then we have the problem of international interference in the internal affairs of free governments, bringing about a situation that leads to subversion, difficulties and recriminations within countries--sometimes even revolutions.

These problems are made all the more serious by complications between governments. These problems of which I speak often have arisen as an aftermath of wars and conflicts. But governments are divided also by differing ambitions, by differing ideologies, by mutual distrust and the alarm that each creates. Because of these alarms, nations build up armaments and place their trust for peace and protection in those armaments. These armaments create greater alarms, and so we have a spiral of growing uneasiness and suspicion and distrust. That is the kind of thing that the world faces today. For these things there is no easy settlement. In the brief time that this conference can exist it is impossible to pursue all of the long and tedious negotiations that must take place before the details of these problems can be settled.

Our many postwar conferences have been characterized too much by attention to details, by an effort apparently to work on specific problems, rather than to establish a spirit and attitude in which to approach them. Success, therefore, hwas been meager. Too often, indeed, these conferences have been mere opportunities for exploitation of nationalistic ambitions, or, indeed, only sounding boards for the propaganda that the participants wanted to spread to the world.

If we look at this record we would say, "Why another conference? What hope is there for success?" Now, the first thing that I ask you is, "Do we want to do nothing; do we want to sit and drift along to the inevitable end of such a contest--new tensions and then to war or at least to continuing tensions?"

We want peace. We cannot look at this whole situation without realizing, first, that pessimism never won any battles, whether in peace or in war. Next, we will understand that one ingredient has been missing from all these conferences. I mean an intention to conciliate, to understand, to be tolerant, to try to see the other fellow's viewpoint as well as we see our own. I say to you, if we can change the spirit in which these conferences are conducted we will have taken the greatest step toward peace, toward future prosperity and tranquility that has ever been taken in the history of mankind.

I want to give you a few reasons for hope in this project: irst, the people of all the world desire peace--that is, peace for people everywhere. I distinguish between people and governments here for the moment, for we know that the great hordes of men and women who make up the world do not want to go to the battlefield. They want to live in peace--not a peace that is a mere stilling of the guns, but a peace in which they can live happily, and in confidence that they can raise their children in a world of which they will be proud.

That common desire fore peace is something that is a terrific force in this world, and to which I believe all political leaders in the world are beginning to respond. They must recognize it.

Another item. Did you note this morning the speech made by Premier Bulganin in Moscow? Every word he said was along the lines that I am speaking. He talked of conciliation and tolerance and understanding. I say to you, I say to all the world, if the words that he expressed are as truly reflective of the hearts and minds of all the people in Russia, and the hearts and minds of all the people in all the world everywhere, there will be no trouble between the Russian delegation and our own at this coming conference.

Now I want to mention another item that is important in this conference. The free world is divided from the Communist world by an iron curtain. The free world has one great factor in common. We are not held together by force but we are held together by this great factor.

It is this. The free world lives under one religion or another. It believes in a divine power. It believes in a supreme being. Now this, my friends, is a very great factor for conciliation and peace at this time. Each of these religions has as one of its basic commandments words that are similar to our Golden Rule--"Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." This means that the thinking of those people is based upon ideas of right, and justice, and mutual self-respect and consideration for the other man. This means peace, because only in peace, can such conceptions as these prevail. This means that the free people of the world hate war; they want peace and are fully dedicated to it.

Now, this country, as other free countries, maintains arms. We maintain formations of war and all the modern weapons. Why? Because we must. As long as this spirit that has prevailed up to now continues to prevail in the world, we cannot expose our rights, our privileges, our homes, our wives, our children to risk which would come to an unarmed country. But we want to make it perfectly clear that these armaments do not reflect the way we want to live. They merely reflect the way, under present conditions, we have to live. Now it is natural for a people steeped in a religious civilization, when they come to moments of great importance--maybe even crises such as now we face--to turn to the divine power that each has in his own heart, for guidance, for wisdom, for some help in doing the thing that is honorable, that is right.

I have no doubt that tonight throughout this country and indeed throughout the free world, that such prayers are ascending. This is a mighty force, and it brings to me the thought that through prayer we could also achieve a very definite and practical result at this very moment.

Suppose on the next sabbath day observed by each of our religions, Americans, 165 million of us, went to our accustomed places of worship, and, crowding those places, asked for help, and by so doing demonstrated to all the world the sincerity and depth of our aspirations for peace. This would be a mighty force. None could then say that we preserve armament because we want to. We preserve it because we must.

My friends, Secretary Dulles and I go to this conference in earnest hope that we may accurately represent your convictions, your beliefs, your aspirations. We shall be conciliatory because our country seeks no conquest, no property of others. We shall be tolerant because this nation does not seek to impose our way of life upon others. We shall be firm in the consciousness of your material and spiritual strength and your defense of your rights. But we shall extend the hand of

friendship to all who will grasp it honestly and concede to us the same rights, the same understanding, the same freedom that we accord to them.

We, the Secretary and I, shall do our best with others there to start the world on the beginning of a new road, a road that may be long and difficult, but which, if faithfully followed, will lead us on to a better and fuller life. Thank you and goodnight.

(163) Remarks Upon Arrival at the Airport in Geneva July 16, 1955

[The President's opening words referred to President Max Petipierre of Switzerland.]

EL-Dl6-39 (IR)

Mr. President:

My wife and I--the party with us--are deeply touched by the honor you have paid us by coming here to the airport to greet us as we land in this wonderful nation of Switzerland.

We are honored that the Governor of the Republic and Canton of Geneva should come out--and the Mayor of the city.

Some eleven years ago, Mr. President, I came to Europe with an army, a navy, an air force, with a single purpose: to destroy Nazism. I came with the formations of war and all of the circumstances of war surrounded that journey at that time.

This time I come armed with something far more powerful: the good will of America--the great hopes of America--the aspirations of America for peace. That is why I have come here, in this beautiful country of yours, to meet with my colleagues from other countries to see whether it is not possible to find some road that will lead all mankind into a more tranquil, better, fuller way of life. I thank you very much.

(165) Remarks at the Research Reactor Building, Palais des Nations, Geneva July 20, 1955

[The President spoke at 3:20pm]

EL-Dl6-39 (IR)

I AM very grateful to the experts in charge of this building for conducting me through the reactor building and showing me so many of the working controls and operations.

Of course, I am very pleased that our country is able here to establish this reactor to help the scientists of the world to make progress along the lines of peaceful use of the atomic energy science, for the welfare of mankind.

In the United States we have so far made agreements with 24 different nations for the use of this same type of research reactor. There are students from 19 different countries going to school in the United States, learning about the technology that applies here--and you can see how necessary that is, just by looking around.

There are students from 32 countries undertaking to learn about the use of radio isotopes, and so on. So all in all this business is proceeding, and we are very pleased to have a part in it. We have

set aside 200 kilograms of fissionable material so far to assist in the effort.

I am very hopeful that more than governments will get interested in this project. I hope that private business and professional men throughout the world will take an interest, and provide an incentive in finding new ways that this new science can be used.

In the meantime, I hope that everybody who gets a chance to see this one, will learn that there are really many, many ways in which atomic science can be used for the benefit of mankind and not destruction. Thank you very much.

(171) Remarks on leaving Geneva July 23, 1995

[The President spoke at the airport just before boarding the Columbine to return to Washington.]

EL-Dl6-39 (IR)

Ladies and gentlemen:

As I leave Geneva, I want most of all, in saying goodbye, to thank the Mayor of this City, and each of its citizens who have been so cordial in the welcome they have extended to the American delegation. My thanks of course include also the government--its President, all its officials, and of course to include the Governor of this Canton. It has been a very great privilege to be among you and we will carry away many happy memories of your beautiful scenery and your very warm spirit of welcome and hospitality towards us. I hope, indeed, that maybe some day I shall come back here again, when I am less busy and when I can see more of the people and less of the inner side of council chambers. Goodbye and good luck to each of you.

(173) Remarks at Washington National Airport on Returning From Geneva July 24, 1955

EL-DI6-58 (RA)

Ladies and Gentlemen:

After the hard week that I have been through it's very heartwarming to have such a reception as this as I come back to our Capital City. Just what will be the result of this conference, of course, no one knows but the coming months will tell much. But in the meantime, we do know that new contacts have been established and there is evidence of a new friendliness in the world. For my part, if there is one man I would single out as deserving the thanks of the American people, it would be Foster Dulles, a man who represents us in every kind of conference with the greatest of dignity and the greatest of skill. I am sorry he is not here this morning-his plane seems to be a little slower than mine and so he is not here at this moment. Again thanks to all of you for coming out, distinguished citizens and everybody else. It's really great to be home. Thank you.

(175) Radio and Television Address to the American People on the Geneva Conference July 25, 1955

[Delivered from the President's Office at 10:30pm.]

EL-Dl6-58 (RA)

Good evening friends:

Secretary Dulles and I, with our associates, went to the Big Four Conference at Geneva resolved to represent as accurately as we could the aspirations of the American people for peace and the principles upon which this country believes that peace should be based.

In this task we had the bi-partisan, indeed almost the unanimous, support of the Congress. This fact greatly strengthened our hand throughout the negotiations. Our grateful thanks go out to all your Senators and your Congressmen in the United States Congress. Aside from this, we had, during the past week, thousands of telegrams of encouragement and support from you as individuals. Along with these came similar telegrams from great organizations, church organizations, business and great labor organizations.

All of these combined served to make us feel that possibly we were faithfully representing the views that you would have us represent. Now peace--the pursuit of peace--involves many perplexing questions. For example: Justice to all nations, great and small; Freedom and security for all these nations; The prosperity of their several economies and a rising standard of living in the world; Finally, opportunity for all of us to live in peace and in security. Now, naturally, in the study of such questions as these, we don't proceed recklessly. We must go prudently and cautiously--both in reaching conclusions and in subsequent action. We cannot afford to be negligent or complacent. But, we must be hopeful. We must have faith in ourselves and in the justice of our cause. If we don't do this, we will allow our own pessimism and our own lack of faith to defeat the noblest purposes that we can pursue.

Now, because of the vital significance of all these subjects, they will be exhaustively surveyed by our government over a period of many weeks. Tonight the most that I can give to you are a few personal impressions and opinions that may have some interest for you and certainly have some bearing on the outcome and on the progress of those negotiations.

Of course, an interesting subject that could be taken up, had I the time, would be the personalities of the several delegations, the relationship or apparent relationships of one to the other-the principal considerations that seem to motivate them. These would all have a bearing on this problem. But I forego them and take up instead just two general opinions in which I am sure every American shares:

The first of these, that we must never be deluded into believing that one week of friendly, even fruitful, negotiation can wholly eliminate a problem arising out of the wide gulf that separates, so far, East and West. A gulf as wide and deep as the difference between individual liberty and regimentation, as wide and deep as the gulf that lies between the concept of man made in the image of his God and the concept of man as a mere instrument of the State. Now, if we think of those things we are apt to be possibly discouraged.

But I was also profoundly impressed with the need for all of us to avoid discouragement merely because our own proposals, our own approaches, and our own beliefs are not always immediately accepted by the other side.

On the night I left for Geneva, I appeared before the television to explain to you what we were seeking. I told you that we were going primarily to attempt to change the spirit in which these great negotiations and conferences were held. A transcript was made of that talk, and I should

like now to read you one paragraph from it.

This is what I said with respect to our purpose: "We realize that one ingredient has been missing from all past conferences. This is an honest intent to conciliate, to understand, to be tolerant, to try to see the other fellow's viewpoint as well as we see our own. I say to you if we can change the spirit in which these conferences are conducted, we will have taken the greatest step toward peace, toward future prosperity and tranquility that has ever been taken in all the history of mankind."

During last week in formal conferences, and in personal visits, these purposes have been pursued. So now there exists a better understanding, a closer unity among the nations of NATO. There seems to be a growing realization by all that nuclear warfare, pursued to the ultimate, could be practically race suicide. There is a realization that negotiations can be conducted without propaganda and threats and invective. Finally, there is a sharp realization by the world that the United States will go to any length consistent with our concepts of decency and justice and right to attain peace. For this purpose, we will work cooperatively with the Soviets and any other people as long as there is sincerity of purpose and a genuine desire to go ahead.

In the course of carrying on these discussions there were a number of specific proposals, some of which were items on the official agenda. That agenda contained German reunification and European security, disarmament and increased contacts of all kinds between the East and the West. Most of these conference meetings were given wide publicity and even some of the specific suggestions made in those conferences likewise were publicized. In any event, I can assure you of one thing:

There were no secret agreements made, either understood agreements or written ones. Everything is put before you on the record. Outside of these conference meetings there were numerous unofficial meetings conversations with important members of the other delegations and, of course, very specifically with the Soviet delegation. In these conversations a number of subjects were discussed and among them the Secretary of State and I specifically brought up, more than once, American convictions and American beliefs and American concern about such questions as the satellites of Eastern Europe and the activities of international Communism. We made crystal clear what were American beliefs about such matters as these.

Now to take up for a moment the items on the official agenda. Probably no question caused us as much trouble as that of German reunification and European security. At first we thought that these could be dealt with separately, but the American delegation concluded that they had to be dealt with as one subject. We held that Germany should be reunited under a government freely chosen by themselves, and under conditions that would provide security both for nations of the East and for nations of the West--in fact in a framework that provided European security.

In the matter of disarmament, the American government believes that an effective disarmament system can be reached only if at its base there is an effective reciprocal inspection and overall supervision system, one in which we can have confidence and each side can know that the other side is carrying out his commitments. Now because of this belief, we joined with the French and the British in making several proposals. Some were global, some were local, some were sort of budgetary in character. But all were in furtherance of this one single objective, that is, to make inspection the basis of disarmament proposals. One proposal suggested aerial photography, as

between the Soviets and ourselves by unarmed peaceful planes, and to make this inspection just as thorough as this kind of reconnaissance can do. The principal purpose, of course, is to convince every one of Western sincerity in seeking peace. But another idea was this: if we could go ahead and establish this kind of an inspection as initiation of an inspection system we could possibly develop it into a broader one, and eventually build on it an effective and durable disarmament system.

In the matter of increasing contacts, many items were discussed. We talked about a freer flow of news across the curtains of all kinds. We talked about the circulation of books and particularly we talked about peaceful trade. But the subject that took most of our attention in this regard was the possibility of increased visits by the citizens of one country into the territory of another, doing this in such a way as to give each the fullest possible opportunity to learn about the people of the other nation. In this particular subject there was the greatest possible degree of agreement. As a matter of fact, it was agreement often repeated and enthusiastically supported by the words of the members of each side.

As a matter of fact, each side assured the other earnestly and-often that it intended to pursue a new spirit of conciliation and cooperation in its contacts with the other. Now, of course, we are profoundly hopeful that these assurances will be faithfully carried out.

One evidence as to these assurances will, of course, be available soon in the language and the terminology in which we will find speeches and diplomatic exchanges couched. But the acid test should begin next October because then the next meeting occurs. It will be a meeting of the Foreign Ministers. Its principal purpose will be to take the conclusions of this conference as to the subjects to be discussed there and the general proceedings to be observed in translating those generalities that we talked about into actual, specific agreements. Then is when real conciliation and some giving on each side will be definitely necessary.

Now, for myself, I do not belittle the obstacles lying ahead on the road to a secure and just peace. By no means do I underestimate the long and exhausting work that will be necessary before real results are achieved. I do not blink the fact that all of us must continue to sacrifice for what we believe to be best for the safety of ourselves and for the preservation of the things in which we believe.

But I do know that the people of the world want peace. Moreover, every other individual who was at Geneva likewise felt this longing of mankind. So, there is great pressure to advance constructively, not merely to reenact the dreary performances, the negative performances of the past.

We, all of us, individually and as a people now have possibly the most difficult assignment of our nation's history. Likewise, we have the most shining opportunity ever possessed by Americans. May these truths inspire, never dismay us.

I believe that only with prayerful patience, intelligence, courage and tolerance, never forgetting vigilance and prudence, can we keep alive the spark ignited at Geneva. But if we are successful in this, then we will make constantly brighter the lamp that will one day guide us to our goal--a just and lasting peace.

Thank you. Good night to each of you.

(218) Message Opening the United Community Campaigns of America July 27, 1955 aired October 2, 1955

[Recorded before the President's hospitalization, was broadcast over radio and television at 7:55pm.]

EL-Dl6-39 (IR)

My Fellow Citizens:

My talk has to do with a strictly domestic matter. Between now and Thanksgiving Day the United Community Campaigns of America will be held. In one town the campaign may be called the United Community Chest; in another, the United Fund or the United Crusade. The names differ, but the one word and the one purpose that all have in common is "united."

The campaigns are united in support of some twenty-one thousand voluntary health, welfare and youth agencies--including the USO, and in many cities, the Red Cross and national causes such as Heart, Cancer and Crippled Children. They ask your help, not through twenty-one thousand separate competitive appeals, but through one annual appeal in each city. Together they constitute the biggest single voluntary cause in our nation.

In addition to the many health services they support, these United Community agencies help social scientists study the cause and cure of family break-downs that wreck homes, hurt children, waste life. They work to prevent and thus to end the plague of juvenile delinquency--and adult delinquency too, may I add. And they constantly wage war against the virus of prejudice, bigotry and inhumanity. They are doing their job the united way because man is a united being. Such an appeal calls for a united response.

So, when the volunteer campaigner knocks at our doors and at our hearts, I urge that we all unite to give him a neighborly welcome.

Thank you very much.

(176) President's Press Conference July 27, 1955

[President Eisenhower's seventy-fourth news conference was held in the Executive Office Building from 10:31 to 11:03am, in attendance: 184.]

EL-Dl6-74 (IR)

THE PRESIDENT. Good morning. Please sit down.

I see you haven't got the air conditioning machinery yet. [Laughter]

I think that it is needless for me to take too much time in the attempt to emphasize the importance I attach to the week through which we have just passed.

Some of you, of course, were in Geneva. You made your own conclusions as to the personalities that we met, the relationships between them, the degree of sincerity you attach to their words.

But one thing is indisputable. For one week of argument and debate that sometimes was, to say

the least, intense, never once did we have a recurrence of the old method of merely talking to constituencies in terms of invective and personal abuse and nationalistic abuse. That in itself is a great gain and one that I hope we shall never lose; because certainly we are going to progress in things of the mind, in things involving policy, only if we discuss differences in objective terms, not in the terms that cause additional antagonism before you get down at all to the heart of the subject that is under discussion.

I don't mean to say that the week was one of such glowing promise that it offers almost a certainty of a new era starting now. I do say there was a beginning of this kind made, and if we are wise enough to do our part, it is just possible that something to the great benefit of man may eventuate.

Now, if I can go from great nationalistic subjects, public subjects, to something that concerns only me and my family: this may not be news, but I got home to be greeted by my daughter-in-law with the statement that if all goes well, I will be a grandfather for the fourth time next Christmas--[applause]--which, of course, was a happy ending to the week.

We will go to questions.

Q. Merriman Smith, United Press: Mr. President, in connection with you disarmament proposal, would you extend the privilege of aerial reconnaissance to atomic energy installations?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I wouldn't want now to go into the complete details that would have to be worked out by professionals and technicians meeting to form the plan that would give effect to the general proposal I made. I would say this: that everything, the blueprint of which I spoke, the layout of your military establishments, in my opinion, should be complete. This would not necessarily involve your manufacturing and production plants; but I would certainly, under the scheme I was thinking of, place a minimum of prohibited areas. I think that I would allow these planes, properly inspected, peaceful planes, to fly over any particular area of either country that they wanted to, because only in this way could you convince them that there wasn't something over there that maybe was, by surprise, ready to attack them, you see.

Q. Robert E. Clark, International News Service: Mr. President, can you tell us if you see anything improper in Secretary Talbott's business activities and how you feel about his remaining on as Secretary of the Air Force?

[Chorus of "Couldn't hear it"]

THE PRESIDENT. This was a question about Secretary Talbott and the investigation that he is undergoing before the committee of Congress. I have no objection to answering this at this moment as far as I am able. But I do warn you that it will take me a little bit of time. First, I do not believe that any man can properly hold public office merely because he is not guilty of any illegal act; and, of course, in this case there is no charge of any illegal act. But I believe it was in or somewhere about the end of October, early November, of 1952, I tried to explain my conception of what a public servant owed to the Government, to the people-that his actions had to be impeccable, both from the standpoint of law and from the standpoint of ethics. So what is now involved is, was a proper standard of ethics violated? This comes, I assume, to this

particular point: was an office used improperly or was a man in an office merely trying to use his own personal influence completely divorced from his office? I assume that is the issue that the committee of Congress is now looking into.

Now, I should like to make one thing clear: those parts of Secretary Talbott's official duties with which I have come in contact have been almost brilliantly performed. He has done, by and large, and so far as I know of these activities, exactly what I believe a Secretary of one of the armed services should do. I suppose the world knows that for some years he has been a personal friend. Nevertheless, my feeling at this moment, in a way, is of a bit of suspended animation. I am going to read the complete record of everything that I can find on this myself, and I will have to make final decision on the basis of the ethics involved. Now, I would not take any action while this investigation is going on because, first of all, the investigation should be conducted while he is a public servant, and he has a perfect right to be heard in every bit of defense he can bring forward. As far as I am concerned then, the matter is temporarily in abeyance, but it is going to be handled by myself personally. I do want to make clear again that when I came back and heard about this, no one has intimated any suggestion of fraud or of wrongdoing in the sense of law. That is clearly out of the question.

Q. Edward Milne, Providence Journal-Bulletin: Mr. President, as a matter of principle, and not specifically in Mr. Talbott's case, because we don't yet have all the facts, how do you distinguish the office from the man in the office? What is that fine line? How do you distinguish?

THE PRESIDENT. As a matter of fact, I really am not prepared to talk about that in any length. It is a difficult one. For myself, I think the only way for a public servant is to avoid any indiscretion that even leans in that way or even gives the appearance that an office might be used. But I do want in this case to be completely just and see the whole record.

Q. Frank van der Linden, Charlotte Observer: Mr. President, the Senate Judiciary Committee yesterday indefinitely deferred a vote on the confirmation of Simon Sobeloff, your Solicitor General, to the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals. I would like to ask whether you are displeased with that delay, and if that should go through the recess of Congress, do you plan to send up a recess appointment?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, you give me news; I didn't know this. Now, as you know, Mr. Sobeloff was appointed from a judgeship to the office of Solicitor General. In that office, I have had a number of contacts with him, and have been impressed with what I thought was his judicial type of mind. I thought he was an excellent appointment to the court. Now, I am not going to challenge, by implication or indirection or any other way, the right of the Senate to make its thorough investigation through its committees of any nominee I send up there for any office. I don't know what it is about, so I can't comment any further except to say I thought it was an excellent appointment.

Q. Sarah McClendon, El Paso Times: Sir, there is a law on the books that says Brigadier General W. W. White, who is Staff Director for Petroleum Logistics, can keep on active duty in his job and, at the same time, draw a salary as former vice president of Esso Export Corporation from his old corporation. I wondered what you think about the administration of this law that permits a high-ranking officer to be recalled to active duty and serve over a subject that is the same as his former corporation.

THE PRESIDENT. I can't possibly comment on that one until I see the case. This is the first time I ever knew there was a special law applying to a special person. I would like to look that up. [Addresses Mr. Hagerty] Will you remember?

Q. William S. White, New York Times: Mr. President, would you care to make any forecast to us of the possibility of a ministerial level meeting with the Chinese in light of what the Secretary of State said yesterday?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I couldn't guess at this moment as to a meeting at the ministerial level. I think you know the record of this whole project up to this moment. I read this morning Secretary Dulles' statement, so to my knowledge it is exactly accurate all the way through, what has come about, why we did raise this level of meeting, and sent Mr. Johnson to Geneva to carry it out. Now, what will come from there, what the next step will be, I am not quite sure.

Q. Clark R. Mollenhoff, Des Moines Register and Tribune: Mr. President, there has been testimony of the SEC Chairman that Sherman Adams intervened before the SEC, which was a quasi-judicial body. Testimony was given by the Chairman on that score. The Democrats are contending that there was something improper in intervening with any quasi-judicial body. I wondered if you looked into that and you have any comment you would like to make about it.

THE PRESIDENT. I looked into it only to this extent: I am sure that the head of the Commission has given the entire story. I understand he is back before the committee, and certainly if he has omitted any details, he should give them now. I believe that Governor Adams has informed the Senate committee that he hasn't a single detail to add; that the story has been told and that is all there is to it.

Q. Garnett D. Homer, Washington Evening Star: In connection with the Dixon-Yates matter, and in view of the fact that the Senate Investigation Subcommittee recently brought out for the first time the part played in initiating the Dixon-Yates contract by Adolphe Wenzell of the First Boston Corporation, which corporation later became the financing agent for Dixon-Yates, in view of all of that, do you believe your directions last summer for disclosure of the complete record in the case were carried out by the agencies concerned?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I didn't know that anyone had alleged that he was the initiator because no such statement has ever been made to me. But what I have done is this: I have gotten back Mr. Dodge who was Director of the Budget when all this was done, when the 1954, I believe, policy on this whole proposition was made, and he is going down before one of the committees. Isn't that correct? Mr. Hagerty: Yes, sir.

THE PRESIDENT. He is going down before one of the committees with instructions to do this: to tell every possible item that has anything whatsoever to bear on Dixon-Yates, and see whether we can get the whole list of information properly coordinated and placed before the people that are investigating it.

Q. Edward P. Morgan, American Broadcasting Company: Mr. President, may we go back to the summit for a moment? Now that one of our main objectives at Geneva seems to be in the process of being achieved, namely the lessening of tensions, is there a danger that they may sag so far that they may trip our defenses, so to speak, and if so, do you have some specific proposals by which we might avoid them?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, there may be some little fear of that, but I would think that as long as the United States has such people as Secretaries Dulles and Wilson, people like Admiral Radford and our current Chiefs of Staff, people to keep us alert to all these things, I would doubt that, in fact, we would as a Government sag too far in the direction that you indicate. Now, your question therefore must be directed towards peoples' thinking, just, "Well, we say we had a nice meeting," and so you forget that item to turn your mind to something else. I would say scarcely so. I have a number of responses to the talk I made the other evening, and it is astonishing how many agree that what we have to do is to steer the course between never being negative but never being complacent. They agree to that. It is a difficult thing. And you have to be watchful. But I don't believe that as long as we have people that are so ready to call our attention to those things and things of that nature we need fear much.

Q. Mrs. May Craig, Maine Papers: Mr. President, in relation to the talks with the Red Chinese in Geneva next week, Mr. Dulles said yesterday that in the talks we would make no arrangements which would prejudice the rights of the Nationalist Chinese. My question is, how can we make any arrangements in the absence of the Nationalist Chinese?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, one of the biggest causes for this meeting is our prisoners and civilians illegally held in China. Certainly we claim that all of our prisoners captured in uniform were illegally held and only four of those have been released. There were fifteen. The first arrangement we are concerned about is how to get them back. That doesn't involve in any respect the Nationalist Chinese.

Q. Mrs. Craig: However, sir, Mr. Dulles left the door open for almost any other kind of a discussion.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, we will have to learn what it is they want to discuss, just exactly as we learned at Geneva many, many things that others wanted to discuss there, but we said only those things which we, as the representatives of four governments are competent to discuss. We couldn't determine the fate of an Arab nation or an African nation or a South American or anything else. We weren't there for that purpose. We must find out, though, what they want to talk about. Then there would have to be a next advance; and it might be, as someone else suggested, eventually you have to go to a ministerial level of meeting to get these straightened out. I wouldn't know.

Q. Mrs. Craig: Sir, the context of his statement on arrangements was in relation to the Formosa area and not in relation to the airmen.

THE PRESIDENT. Mrs. Craig, I just will have to refer you back to the statement. You were apparently trying to interpret exactly what he meant, and you had better ask him.

Q. Lloyd M. Schwartz, Fairchild Publications: Mr. President, I believe you had a request from the copper industry to invoke the Taft-Hartley cooling-off injunction to put an end to the strike. I wondered if you were considering such action?

THE PRESIDENT. Certain telegrams on this subject came in, and they were immediately referred to the Secretary of Labor. Of course, the right to bring that up involves, of course, always the existence or threatened existence of a national emergency, though it will take real study to determine what the situation is.

Q. Donald J. Gonzales, United Press: Did you discuss at Geneva with Soviet leaders the possibility of your visiting Russia or their coming to the United States, either socially or at an official level?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, as you know, on the agenda was the subject of liberalizing contacts. We talked a very great deal, not only about officials visiting back and forth, but increasing opportunities for citizens of each country to go more freely within the other to learn for themselves what their opposite numbers in the other country looked like, how they felt and how they lived. In the very many personal conversations I had with these people, of course, these things never were made in forms of proposals. But opportunities were discussed in a general way--in arranging, let us say--throughout the whole echelons of Government and everything else. But they were never placed in the forms of proposals or definite suggestions.

Q. John Herling, Editors Syndicate: Mr. President, Secretary of Labor Mitchell says that he is recommending to you that you sign the dollar minimum wage which has been passed by both House and Senate. Do you plan to accept his recommendations, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. I can't say for the moment, because he hasn't been in yet to see me. When he comes in to see me, why, I will make up my mind what to do; but he hasn't been in yet.

Q. Fletcher Knebel, Cowles Publications: Mr. President, you were quoted by congressional sources as having told the Monday meeting that Premier Bulganin jokingly said he hoped you would run again; is that correct? [Laughter]

THE PRESIDENT. I don't think I said Premier Bulganin. I said one of my Russian associates. [Laughter]

Q. Alan S. Emory, Watertown Times: Sir, there are two interpretations in Congress being placed on your recommendation for 35,000 additional public housing units to be constructed in the law now before the House. One is that these would be entirely new public housing starts. The other is that these would be, as Congress approved last year, replacement units for families made homeless as a result of urban redevelopment or slum clearance projects. Could you tell us which one is correct, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. Always, one of the special definite purposes of public housing programs was to provide places for those people who were dispossessed by reason of urban redevelopment and slum clearance. I believe, and I say this with some trepidation because my memory is not always correct, I believe that it was in last year's bill that they limited it to that use. To my mind, the limitation is unnecessary; but I don't know what is the status of the thing before Congress at this moment.

Q. Edward T. Folliard, Washington Post and Times Herald: Mr. President, while you have been away, the bus and trolley strike here has continued. As I remember it, at the last press conference you suggested that both sides get around a table and try to thrash this thing out and reach a settlement. They haven't done so, and the prospect is that this strike will be on by the time you leave for Denver. I wonder if you had any further suggestions?

THE PRESIDENT. I really haven't at this moment, Mr. Foillard, for the simple reason I hadn't thought about it since I came back, and no one has made any reports on it. But I do hold to this:

in the long run, the managerial and labor elements in our economy must find means of resolving their own differences or our form of economy and government becomes endangered. You can have the services of mediators, you can have all sorts of things to protect yourself in the event of grave national emergency, but by and large we must depend upon the good sense of America to meet this type of problem, and I mean the good sense of the people engaged, or we are going to have much more difficulty than we have now.

Q. John Kenton, New York Journal of Commerce: Mr. President, if we may look ahead for the moment to the next Geneva conference beginning next month on atoms for peace, there was a press conference over at the Atomic Energy Commission about 2 weeks ago at which there seemed to be a little bit of confusion over two statements that you, Mr. President, had made at two different times. One, that our attitude toward this conference was not that we were going into a contest, and the other that we were going to put our best foot forward. Now, the point was made that the American manufacturing concerns that are going over there to exhibit in the trade fair at Geneva are certainly going over there with the intention of trying to outsell their competitors from other countries, and we never got the point completely cleared as to whether there were any wraps other than the Atomic Energy Law of 1954 on American commercial participation in the conference.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, it is a little difficult to address myself to a question I don't quite understand. [Laughter] But I do say this: we are not going over there just to show that we are better than anyone else in the world in a certain line of scientific advancement. We are going over there to help incite the interest of all the world in this new science and how it can be helpful to mankind. I personally went to see this part of the exhibition that we have put over there. I said we were going to put our best foot forward. If we are going to try to help people in this regard, we are certainly not going to keep two-thirds of our scientists and our industrialists and people working on it at home, and show only one-third of what we have done and what we believe are the opening vistas in this direction. So I say we are going to do our very best. But we didn't enter, didn't propose or go to this thing just with the idea of contesting or putting our affairs in comparison with somebody else's.

Q. Ray L. Scherer, National Broadcasting Company: Mr. President, how did you get along with Marshal Zhukov?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, excellently, of course, because--I must reinforce what I have said before. In the personal contacts of this meeting I saw nothing that violated the strictest rules of good manners and deportment. Quite naturally, Marshal Zhukov and I had the common recollections of 6 months' cooperative work in Berlin, to say nothing of a common reminiscence of the final campaigns of World War II in Europe. Now, on top of that, he wanted to tell me things about Russia, in general, or about the Soviet Union in general, about his own life, about what is happening there. He came to the first meeting--I believe we had two hours and a half together--and I told him I would regard it quite confidentially; it would never become a part of the official records, because he visited me personally. After all, he is a Marshal, and I happen to be head of a state. He said, "You are perfectly free to tell any part of it." He didn't come to talk in deep secrecy. But, in general, it was to impress upon me the deep desire of the Soviets for peace. He went into many subjects. For example, their new concept of collective leadership; it was a very interesting thing, but it was, also, an hour's conversation. And you can see some evidence of its practice--you don't have just one figure coming to an international conference, you have three

or four of them constantly conferring, and apparently producing a viewpoint for the world. But there was nothing in it except, you might say, a personal and friendly exposition of the same things that we heard in the conference, but on a larger scale.

Q. Clark R. Mollenhoff, Des Moines Register and Tribune: I hate to go back to Dixon-Yates again, but there was one thing I don't think was completely clear. There were some AEC officials, Mr. Fields and Mr. Cook, who testified that Mr. Wenzell's name was knowingly eliminated from the Dixon-Yates chronology; and, of course, they stated this was on the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget. I wondered if you knew anything of this, and if you did know of it, if you would like to comment on whether you thought it was important.

THE PRESIDENT. I don't intend to comment on it any more at all. I think I have given to this conference, time and again, the basic elements of this whole development, and everything that I could possibly be expected to know about it. I said Mr. Dodge, who initiated this whole thing, is going down before the committee to again begin the process of taking this thing from its inception and following it through until he turned over to Mr. Hughes; and I believe that Mr. Hughes is to be there if they want him again. Now, they can tell the entire story, and I don't know exactly such details as that. How could I be expected to know? I never heard of it.

Q. William M. Blair, New York Times: Are you satisfied, sir, with the Reserve bill that Congress has sent to you?

THE PRESIDENT. No. At least there are one or two items that strike me as being rather thoughtlessly handled. But I haven't studied it in detail yet. I will have to look at it and I could comment on that maybe next week. I haven't studied it in detail, but I have heard of one item of differences in pay that seem incomprehensible to me.

Q. Joseph Chiang, Chinese News Service: Mr. President, do the United States Government agree to have two Chinas if they are sure there would be a peace in the world for a good while?

THE PRESIDENT. Did you say who agreed to that?

Q. Mr. Chiang: Do your Government agree to have a two Chinas .

THE PRESIDENT. The subject in that form has never been discussed that I know of, certainly I have never discussed the subject in that form with Secretary Dulles; but I don't see how it could be under present conditions.

Merriman Smith, United Press: Thank you, Mr. President.

(177)Remarks at the Ceremony Marking the Issuance of the Atoms for Peace Stamp July 28, 1955

[The ceremony was held on the White House lawn. The President spoke following remarks by the Postmaster General and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. The Postmaster General noted that the stamp carried a quotation from the President's address before the United Nations General Assembly of December 8, 1953: "To find the way by which the inventiveness of man shall be consecrated to his life." Chairman Strauss called attention to the fact that the stamp was dedicated only a few days before the opening in

Geneva of the first International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy.]

EL-DI6-39 (IR)

Mr. Postmaster General, distinguished members of the diplomatic corps, my friends:

As the Postmaster General has said, we have here a stamp that looks to the future, and its design has followed that conception. Yet, it tends also to pose to us a question that is as old as history: Shall the inventiveness of man be used for good or for evil?

Every discovery we have made, even the use of fire to warm our bodies, to cook our food, has also been used as one of the devastating weapons of war to bring destruction to enemies. Every single thing that man has discovered can be used for good or for evil depending upon the purpose of man. This would seem to imply that man indeed has to look within himself before he can predict with any certainty, with any possibility of accuracy whatsoever, before he can determine what will be the final results of a great invention such as the discovery of nuclear fission and nuclear fusion.

The United States, as you well know, has been attempting to do its part in promoting the peaceful, the good uses of this new science. The Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission has outlined some of them to you. And, I should like to go further and leave no stone unturned in order to discover new ways in which all of us nations that love peace can, without threat to anybody else, without fear for our own security, move forward in this field.

Now, because of this belief, because of this feeling, because of this hope, I call your attention to what I think is a fortunate feature in the design of this stamp. We have the world bound together by new forces, bound together by the natural forces of science, and of nature, not split by them.

I hope, I devoutly pray that this is an augury of what will occur in the future--that through these great benefits there will become so deeply impressed upon our minds the benefits that can come from this new science, that finally men will look within themselves and find the courage to reject the impulses of their own avarice, their own selfishness, their own greed, be it individual or national, and attempt at least in this kind of work to proceed toward the good of us all.

Thank you very much for coming.

(181) Remarks to Members of the Bull Elephant Club August 2, 1955

[The President spoke on the South Lawn of the White House. His opening words referred to Norman Wolfson, President of the Club, which consists of administrative and secretarial assistants to the Republican Members of Congress.]

EL-Dl6-39 (IR)

THANK YOU, Mr. Wolfson, members of the Committee.

My name is Dwight D. Eisenhower. I live in the house to your left front and work in the office to your left. I was told to come out here to meet Bull Elephants, and I must say every day in Washington you learn something.

Of course I am complimented by the sentiments of the resolution you have just heard read. When any American believes that another is qualified for holding public office, high or low, he is paying to that other person a very deep compliment because standards for public service should be, and I think in the main are, such that anyone who holds Federal office, or State or municipal office, is really set apart somewhat in the consciousness of America. So, I am truly grateful to those people for the confidence they express.

Now, if I can say anything that would be worth your while after coming all the distance from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue through this heat to give me a chance to greet you, it certainly will not be, and should not be, about me, my person, or my future decisions. It should be about the country and the Government for which you work, the Nation that you serve, and the party through which you perform that service. I think it would also be unnecessary for me to go back into what we hope for this country.

We hope, of course, in general terms for peace--peace with honor and security, for a fine flourishing and expanding economy and for the opportunity for all to participate in the productivity that that economy should have.

We hope for growing opportunities for ourselves and for our younger friends, and those coming after us, and our own children. But, when we talk about our party as an instrument to bring those things about, then we get a little closer I think to what we call legislative programs, things to implement the Government's part in achieving these great goals and aspirations.

I assure you that I for one know something of the great part you play in bringing about those programs. I have on my staff a few people who, had they stayed down there, would probably be eligible for membership in the Bull Elephants; Jack Martin and Gerry Morgan and others and Max Rabb, who have served down on the Hill with you.

They never let me forget what the principal secretaries and the filing clerks and all the others that answer the phones do, what they mean to legislation, what they mean to good will, what they mean to oiling the machinery that will allow a political party to achieve its own will on the Senate and House floors. But, I would like to talk a little bit more, go a little deeper into this matter of a party than just the mechanisms, the oiling of the machinery, the preventing of friction. We want, of course, honor and integrity in Government. We cannot only work for it, we cannot only preach it, we can exemplify it, and by that amount strengthen our party. We can also help to represent to all people in our own districts, in our own municipalities, and here in Washington, the desire of the Republican Party that this Nation go forward as it was conceived where individual opportunity for every man should be equally shared, where opportunity should be limitless so far as his capacities, his own ability, will enable him to take advantage of it.

We want no regimented state. We want no direction from the Federal Government where that is not necessary. We want, in our individual sense, the maximum of freedom so long as we do not trespass on the freedom of others.

But, when we come to the problem of determining where does the Federal Government's responsibility begin and end in all this--now we are really attacking the problem that each political party must solve for itself, in specific terms, before I think it can stand up and say: this is the party through which you can achieve the kind of ambitions of which I am talking, or this is

the party that has another doctrine.

It is idle to say that the Federal Government can be as standoffish with respect to the affairs of Detroit, Michigan; or Abilene, Kansas; or San Antonio, Texas; as it was let us say 100 years ago. Life has gotten more complicated.

Our whole international situation affects each of us more closely than it did then, and the Federal Government is solely in charge of foreign relations. So, we have to determine: where do we want the Federal Government to go into this business and where do we want it to draw the line that they shall not go past. That is the kind of problem we have.

For myself I believe this--I believe that it is stated better by Lincoln than any other man--he said the function of Government is to do for the individual all of those things which he cannot do at all or which he cannot so well do for himself; but in all those things where the community or the individual can take care of his own affairs, the Federal Government ought not to interfere. That isn't quite an exact quotation, but it is almost exact. Now that is the kind of rule I think we should set up for ourselves.

We must never be a party that is indifferent to the sufferings of a great community where, through some unusual cause, people are out of work, where people can't educate their own children, where through any kind of disaster, natural or economic, people are suffering.

We must not only be alive to the requirements of that situation, but we must be alive to preventing it. But we must not put the Federal Government into this thing to the extent that we kill individual initiative, that we destroy the local responsibility for as far as it should reach in these matters. If we do, then we are starting to thread the way to regimentation, to Federal control.

I believe that if we stand for what I would call the great middle way in determining this line between Federal control and proper functions of the Federal Government, that if we stand irrevocably, inevitably, for decency and honor in Government, if we stand for peace abroad, for strength by which we protect ourselves while we are bringing about more peaceful relations, then in general we are doing what the Republican Party stands for. I believe if successful in carrying out this kind of a program, the Republican Party will continue to stay in power. That is because it will have proved itself worthy of the confidence of the United States, will have proved that it is in the hands of competent, devoted, loyal people who are extremists neither in the terms of being a reactionary or of believing in complete Federal control and responsibility, whether it be power, or whether it be anything else. It will have proved that we are the kind of people who can be trusted with the running of Federal, State, and local government.

Now, if we are going to achieve the kind of organization that I so roughly pictured, if we are to be successful in that, it is not enough merely to have fine presidential, vice presidential, senatorial, gubernatorial, and congressional candidates--all the way down the line.

We must also have loyal workers, workers that provide the staffs as you do for the leaders of such a group, who are devoted to a cause, because you believe in something. You believe in something that, because of the vastness of this Nation, is sometimes difficult to explain, but which you have in your heart very clearly written there. You believe in something, and you are carrying it out, in order for our Nation to have the benefit of that kind of a policy and program,

and not primarily because you want to work in Washington. And I say that especially on a day like this!

Your efforts are above selfish ambition, no matter how ambitious one may be, and of course ambition is necessary. Someone told me the other day: ambition is like tempering steel--too little and the steel is no good; too much and it is brittle and breaks. Something to think about. Little bit like salt in your food. Of course you must have it, but your ambition, your burning ambition, must always be for the country--and for yourself as it fits into doing the very best you can for that country.

Now, I suppose that a person here could take up a lot of the special bills before Congress that I am interested in, plead for help, and probably do a better job than I do when I sometimes address some of your bosses. I am not going to do that. It is not my function here this morning, but rather to thank you. For all of the work you have done, for the work you are doing, thank you very much, very much indeed, and I hope that again one of these days I will get a chance to see you. Thank you for the compliment of coming out in this heat to see me. Goodbye.

Mr. Wolfson read the following statement:

Dear Mr. President:

It would be superfluous to tell you of the pleasure it is for us to meet with you today. We are not going to petition you to accept the Republican nomination again in 1956 for we know the constant efforts, so much more persuasive than ours could be, toward that end. But, we of the Bull Elephants Club, male assistants to the Republican Members of the House, would like to impart two thoughts at this time. It is with profound respect that we look on you as the leader of the people of the United States and of our Republican Party. We also state without a dissenter among our ranks that if you do accept the Republican nomination next year, we, who in many instances are a direct liaison to the grass roots of the voting forces throughout the United States, will devote our unceasing efforts, our whole-hearted support, our very all to easing the burden of your campaign.

Most sincerely yours,

GIB DARRISON

(Miller, N.Y.)

MONTY MONROE

(Betts of Ohio)

PAUL SQUIRES

(Harden of Indiana)

NORMAN WOLFSON

(Kean of N.J.)

Chairman, Bull Elephants Club, Ike Committee

(183) Remarks at Presentation of the Medal of Freedom to Robert B. Anderson August 3, 1955

[The President spoke in the Rose Garden.]

EL-Dl6-39 (IR)

[Text read by Commander Edward L. Beach, Naval Aide to the President]

CITATION TO ACCOMPANY THE AWARD

OF THE MEDAL OF FREEDOM TO

ROBERT B. ANDERSON

To ROBERT B. ANDERSON, for exceptionally meritorious service in furtherance of the security of the United States.

As Secretary of the Navy Mr. Anderson rendered a brilliant performance in the administration of that service. As Deputy Secretary of Defense he continued to apply in superb fashion sound judgment and keen foresight in formulating and resolving programs of interest to this nation and its allies.

Through his work in international affairs--in particular, his service as Defense Member of the Operations Coordinating Board and his participation in meetings of the North Atlantic Council and in the development of the St. Lawrence Seaway program-he has contributed to the sound advancement of our national security.

In these activities and in many other ways Mr. Anderson has rendered great service to his country. It is my pleasure to award him the Medal of Freedom. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

[Remarks of the President]

I must say that if you give these only to persons going away, I really am fairly disappointed to be giving you this. It has been a wonderful experience to have you here. I am sorry you are leaving us so early--next Friday, I believe--but we will look forward to your coming back sometime to the service of your country because the kind of performance you have rendered is one that we would like to see repeated often here.

NOTE: The President spoke in the Rose Garden. Mr. Anderson replied:

"Thank you, sir.

"Mr. President, I would say that there has never been a more rewarding experience of my life, and I have never had a greater privilege nor a greater honor than to serve under your administration and to serve with Mr. Wilson. All I can say now is that I will always be obedient to any wishes that you may have, and God bless you in your work."

Mr. Anderson served as Secretary of the Navy from February 4, 1953, through May 3, 1954, and then as Deputy Secretary of Defense through August 4, 1955.

(185) President's Press Conference August 4, 1955 [President Eisenhower's seventy-fifth news conference was held in the Executive Office Building from 2:32 to 2:55pm, in attendance: 201.]

EL-Dl6-75 (PC)

THE PRESIDENT. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen.

With Congress over, I suppose it is time for a brief roundup of successes and failures. We talked about a great deal during this session and now we will apparently have a recess for a while.

In the field of foreign affairs I think this Congress, like the one before it, has shown a complete appreciation of the need for bipartisan approach, and I think that any advances that the Government has been able to make in the whole field of foreign affairs must be credited likewise to the action of Congress as well as to the skill of our Secretary of State and many other negotiators.

I think that the whole record of both the 83d and 84th Congresses in this respect--and I am talking about the mass votes and support--has been commendable, and certainly I for one am deeply grateful.

Now, in the field of domestic legislation, we have first of all to look at the background of the actual situation. America is today enjoying almost unprecedented prosperity. I think last month our employment was an all-time high, with unemployment well below 4 percent.

The incomes are up, purchasing is up; and above all, America has had over this period of the last 2 1/2 years a sound stabilized dollar which has, of course, preserved the values of pensions and insurance policies and the like.

Now, if we are going to keep that kind of thing moving, it means that there must forever be action, not only in the economic and industrial field on the part of the individuals in our system of free enterprise, but Government as well; where its actions in the whole field of credit and taxation and other kinds of economic legislation touch upon our economy, it must look forward to the future. It cannot rest on any record, no matter how good.

I think, about the end of June, I was asked here about the record of Congress and the legislation I thought I needed; and besides referring back to my opening state of the Union speech last January, I reached in my pocket and pulled out a little list, which I still have. [Laughter]

Now, you will remember there were 13 items on it: highway construction, military reserves, military survivors' benefits, housing legislation, health program, school construction, mutual security appropriation, Refugee Act amendments, water resources, customs simplification, minimum wage, the atomic ship, and Hawaiian statehood.

Of those 13, only 4 have been enacted into law, although it is true that before June there were others that did affect this whole economic situation and our domestic circumstances.

But of these 13, only military reserves, housing legislation, mutual security appropriation, and minimum wage were enacted into law, and some of those, in my opinion, with provisions that were not wise.

There are four of the remaining nine that I think are absolutely vital to our future, and some that must be handled as soon as Congress comes back. They are: school construction for our children, the health program, the highway program, and the water resources.

You will remember in the water resources program, when I mentioned that before, I brought up especially such projects as the Upper Colorado River, the Frying Pan, and the Cougar, and others. I still believe that we must attack these things intelligently on a broad base or we cannot expect to continue the kind of prosperity, the kind of full employment, that we are now enjoying. And so it would be completely futile on my part to say that in this field, in this domestic field, that I believe we have been as successful in this past Congress as we should have been.

We must make progress, and it will be my earnest effort as quickly as the next Congress opens, to bring these things very emphatically to the attention of both the House and the Senate. I think that is all I have to say. We will go to questions.

Q. Robert E. Clark, International News Service: Mr. President, Premier Bulganin appears to have rejected your aerial inspection and military blueprint plans on the grounds that they are unrealistic. Can you tell us how you feel about this, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. I believe his exact language was that he thought his proposal of May 10th with its provisions for inspection were more realistic than were the suggestions I made. Speaking informally at Geneva, I said if they trusted that kind of an inspection system, it was all right with us; we would adopt both. And I proposed--I said, let's take them both. Now, we are engaged here in the beginning of developing methods by which we can tell, we can have great confidence that the other fellow is doing exactly what he said he would do; and secondly, we would hope that this would be an approach toward real disarmament. Now, these are matters that take long examination by experts. I don't understand that the Premier closed the door, and I merely say we are ready to accept and examine any kind of system that looks fair to us and to both sides.

Q. Charles S. von Fremd, CBS News: The Atomic Energy Commission announced today, sir, that from what they, from their own explorations, that the Russians had exploded some type of thermonuclear bomb. I wonder if you could tell us what significance this means to you, and if it represents possibly something that might not be as optimistic as you felt at the summit.

THE PRESIDENT. I believe you made one error in your premise. I do not believe they said "thermonuclear." I believe they merely said an explosion of atomic character. I am not going to attempt at this moment to interpret this incident in terms of Soviet intent. I would say that if in their scientific development, if they found that they had come to the place where they could go no further without tests, they just made tests as a matter of course. You know, there have been several series since 1949 when the first one, I believe, was detected. This could mean anything, but not necessarily, as I see it, not necessarily a change in their, let us say, more conciliatory attitude that they have shown in the past weeks and months.

Q. Edward T. Foillard, Washington Post and Times Herald: Mr. President, it seems as if something is always happening to puncture that moratorium you talked about in the spring. Yesterday some Ohio Republicans called on you to urge you to run again, and they represented you as saying this: that if you could foresee what the situation will be a year from now, presumably the world situation, if you could foresee that, then you could say what your plans for

1956 would be. They also quoted you as remarking on the strong sense of duty one gets in a long service, long career in the armed services. Could you say, Mr. President, whether Geneva has made it more or less likely that you will run in 1956? [Laughter]

THE PRESIDENT. Eddie, I can say this: this now pushes my year that I don't have to answer this far forward. I said a year from the last question would be the moratorium.

Q. Mr. Folliard: I might withdraw that question. [Laughter]

THE PRESIDENT. I was talking to a group of very staunch Republicans, I assure you, and naturally questions such as you bring up now normally arise when there is such a gathering of that kind. What I intended to imply, that if I now were such an infallible prophet that I could understand all about the world situation, the domestic situation, and my own situation, including the way I felt, and possibly with the health and everything else, as of that moment, then there would be no great excuse for deferring the decision. I have not that gift of prophecy.

Q. Frank van der Linden, Nashville Banner: Mr. President, Senator George led a delegation of Congressmen and Senators from the cotton and textile States into your office Monday for discussion of a proposal to move some of this surplus cotton overseas, and also to levy import quotas on textiles. I wonder what your policy is going to be on that, sir.

THE PRESIDENT. I think that very soon the Secretary of Agriculture will be able to come up with something that, if it does not wholly meet the views of everybody in the administration, that we shall have to say, what we intend to do in the immediate future. Now, just one word about that delegation. Senator George suggested a meeting. I invited him up, and I think it was the first idea that two or three were to come with him. It ended up, I believe, with 60 or about that. But I want to make this clear. I found that for a moment, at least, my office was a place for a debating society. There were views expressed that were as bitterly antagonistic to this 2-price system and quota system as you can well imagine. So it is one of those questions for which there is no easy answer, and I am not going to try to forestall the completion of studies within the Cabinet so that it can be announced at the proper time.

Q. Chalmers M. Roberts, Washington Post and Times Herald: Mr. President, to return to the disarmament matter a minute, I take it from what you said about Bulganin's statement, you are not discouraged about the prospects of some progress in this field as a whole. Is that correct, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, Mr. Roberts, here is the situation: our foreign ministers are going to meet in October, there was opened up at Geneva a more or less broad road of approach to these several problems which were agreed that the foreign ministers should study, and among them was disarmament. So I think that the statements that Mr. Bulganin has made should not be taken as at all foreclosing his readiness or the readiness of the Soviet representatives to discuss the matter.

Q. Mr. Roberts: Could I ask this also, sir? Is it your intention that when the U.N. Disarmament Subcommittee meets later this month, that the United States will have a new and complete program to offer, or will it be pretty much what you made public at Geneva?

THE PRESIDENT. I can't answer in complete detail. As you know, Governor Stassen is working on this constantly and is trying to coordinate the views of the several departments of

Government, and there will unquestionably be new ideas of more specific type than I expressed at Geneva. At Geneva I expressed a readiness on the part of the United States to pursue a course of mutual reciprocal disarmament in any, almost any type where we could be sure that everybody was acting in good faith. My inspection proposal was just a mere beginning that I wanted to propose of a type of inspection system that would ensure that confidence. I think, therefore, that you can expect some new proposals, but naturally none of them will be in a final, fixed and rigid position. Otherwise there would be no room for negotiations.

Q. Sarah McClendon, El Paso Times: Sir, Senator Matthew Neely said it would be a conflict of principle as well as a conflict of interests for the Defense Department to continue to have as its petroleum logistics director General W. W. White, who is also on the payroll of Esso Export Corporation. You said last time you would inquire into this situation. I wonder if you have had time to do so.

THE PRESIDENT. I understand that my press secretary had given you the answer.

Q. Mrs. McClendon: No, sir.

THE PRESIDENT. The answer is that there was no special legislation passed for General White. It was legislation that dates from 1941, and I believe renewed in 1948, which does not apply to reserve officers, which General White is. He is not a regular officer at all; he has the title of General, though in the reserves. It authorizes the Government to employ such people without requiring them to go through the same divesting of interests that you do regulars. That is the situation under which General White was employed and, of course, it would be idle to employ as a consultant anyone who didn't know something about the petroleum business. He is bound to come from the petroleum industry. Now, I believe beyond that, the Defense Department has issued a very complete statement; and beyond what I have said, I should say, "Go to see Secretary Wilson."

Q. Milton B. Freudenheim, Chicago Daily News: Mr. President, I have been asked to ask you whether you will be able to go to Chicago for the Governors' Conference.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I don't think there are any plans. I don't even think I have had any negotiations with them on that subject at all for this particular meeting.

Q. Mr. Freudenheim: Another question that they asked me to ask you

THE PRESIDENT. That they asked? Who is "they"?

Q. Mr. Freudenheim: The Chicago Daily News.

THE PRESIDENT. Oh, I see. All right. [Laughter]

Q. Mr. Freudenheim: I think you may have indicated as to your plans for calling a special session on highway legislation. Were you telling us a moment ago that you would wait until Congress came back?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I didn't say I would wait. As of this moment, after all, a special session is a rather critical and serious thing, an expensive thing. I have not by any manner of means dismissed the possibility that that might be needful, but as of now, I have made no such decision

whatever.

Q. Mr. Freudenheim: Thank you, sir.

Q. William Theis, International News Service: Mr. President, could you tell us now as to what your intentions are as to signing the housing bill?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I have just gotten the preliminary studies on it, and actually I was talking about it within the half hour. I couldn't say exactly, because it does have some features that I am not certain yet whether they are permissive or directive, and I must take a look at that part of it.

Q. Richard L. Wilson, Cowles Publications: Mr. President, recently in Congress and in the newspapers, the suggestions have been made that some sort of a new negotiation is under way with the Red Chinese which might involve the status of Quemoy, Matsu, and Formosa. Is any such negotiation under way, and if not, what is the nature of the present negotiations?

THE PRESIDENT. The present negotiations were called to discuss the question of nationals of one country retained within the territory of the other. Now, it was admitted that the discussions might find other subjects which could be discussed, but both the Secretary and I have frequently stated we are not going to discuss the affairs of our friends when our friends are absent. We count the Nationalists on Formosa as our friends. We are not going to discuss their future or their destiny or anything about them until they are there.

Q. Charles E. Shutt, Telenews: Along that same line, sir, it has been suggested in some quarters that further negotiations be planned with the Red Chinese as a result of the Geneva talks that are going on now. If after suitable preliminary conferences were held, would you at all favor a summit meeting with all parties concerned to settle Asian tensions?

THE PRESIDENT. I think not at this time. I think it would be far too much in advance to talk about the possibility of a summit meeting. They have implications that do not follow upon meetings at a somewhat lower level. Now, I believe the Secretary has said that it is within the realm of possibility that these meetings will lead to negotiations possibly on ministerial level, but I think nothing further has been hinted at.

Q. David P. Sentner, Hearst Newspapers: Is there any possibility that you might call a special session of Congress to deal with the highway legislation?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I tried to answer that question a minute ago. There is always the possibility, but as of this moment, I have no decision. I have made no decision of that kind.

Q. Mr. Sentner: And if the next Congress takes it up without a special session, do you plan to make a new proposal for financing the method of construction?

THE PRESIDENT. I did say in my original recommendations that I recognized there could be more than one method of financing, but at a time when we wanted definitely to allocate certain user type of money to the paying of those roads, we needed the roads now, and when Congress very definitely and I think maybe a lot more people do not want to raise the public debt, there remained one method: the corporation or the authority method. And that is the one I proposed. I

might accept some modification, of course I would. But what I want first of all is roads, and then a way to pay for it that will be acceptable and fair to the taxpayers.

Q. Clark R. Mollenhoff, Des Moines Register: Mr. President, I wonder if you could tell us how you feel Air Secretary Talbott's activities measured up to the standards that you wish to maintain in your administration?

THE PRESIDENT. I think the record speaks for itself. I have nothing more to add to that.

Q. Martin Agronsky, American Broadcasting Company: Mr. President, it has been remarked that in the negotiations at Geneva, that we have been referring to the representatives of the Chinese Communist Government as the People's Republic of China. In return, the Chinese Communists are referring to us as the United States instead of apparently the usual title, which is a capitalistic aggressor. And generally the atmosphere seems to be one in which people now think there has been a change in the attitude of our Government toward the possible recognition of the legitimacy of the Chinese Government, that is, the Chinese Communist Government. Has there been any development along those lines, sir, and does this difference in nomenclature that we are now officially using have any significance?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I would say this: the change of nomenclature is without significance, because possibly--I wasn't even personally aware of any change. When you are sitting in conference and your conferees may refer to a particular group under a certain name, you naturally are in the habit of referring to it the same way. So this question of nomenclature is without significance whatsoever. Now, several times I have stated that as long as Red China is branded as a dictator by the United Nations, which it still is, due to the fact that its armies are in North Korea, we have no choice of our own, and I don't know how the United Nations has a choice of its own. There are other outstanding complaints which I have outlined time and again, and I have no idea that under existing circumstances there would be a change of the kind you indicated in our policy.

Q. Robert J. Donovan, New York Herald Tribune: Did you say "branded a dictator" or "branded an aggressor?"

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I mean "branded an aggressor." If I said "dictator," I was wrong. Branded an aggressor by the United Nations for going into Northern Korea, you will recall.

Q. Joseph R. Slevin, New York Herald Tribune: Mr. President, do you believe there is a serious threat of inflation?

THE PRESIDENT, What is that?

Q. Mr. Slevin: Do you believe that there is a serious threat of inflation at this time?

THE PRESIDENT. I wouldn't say "serious threat," but let us remember that any free economy is always in a situation of balance, even though it is going forward in its expansion and in its productivity. There are always present the two, twin dangers of deflation and inflation, and the function of Government so far as it affects this matter at all is to be watchful, to be vigilant and alert, and to take measures from time to time that tend to move in one direction if the signs are we are moving in the other. But as of this moment we have, I repeat, an activity, a productivity,

that is almost beyond calculation, measured by former standards. So the time is here to be watchful; but I wouldn't say there was serious danger, no.

Robert E. Clark, International News Service: Thank you, Mr. President.

(188) Remarks on the Presentation of the Distinguished Service Medal to Admiral Robert B. Carney August 4, 1955 [The President made the presentation in the Rose Garden.]

EL-Dl6-40 (IR)

[Text read by Cmdr. Edward L. Beach, Naval Aide to the President]

THE PRESIDENT of the United States takes pleasure in awarding the Distinguished Service Medal (Gold Star in lieu of Fourth Award) to ADMIRAL ROBERT B. CARNEY, UNITED STATES NAVY for service as set forth in the following CITATION:

For exceptionally meritorious service to the Government of the United States in a duty of great responsibility as Chief of Naval Operations and Member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for a period of two years commencing 17 August 1953. Exercising the highest quality of command leadership during this period of international tension, Admiral Carneydisplayed foresight and keen understanding in directing the unified commands for which he was executive agent. He greatly furthered combat readiness of Naval operating forces by insisting upon incorporating the latest scientific developments into naval construction programs. As a Member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff he participated in the formulation of strategic plans for the defense of the United States and the establishment of policy dedicated to maintaining peace and freedom throughout the world. In this capacity he fostered and promoted the most harmonious relationships among the Services. Admiral Carney's contribution to the aspirations of mankind and to the Government of the United States will always reflect the highest credit upon himself and the United States Naval Service.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

(208) Remarks on the Hurricane-Flood Disaster in the Northeastern States August 22, 1955

[The President spoke in his office at Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colo. His remarks were recorded for broadcasting over radio and television. On August 23, the White House released the text of messages concerning the disaster exchaged between the President and Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. The text of similar messages between the President and Prime Minister Eden of the United Kingdom, King Baudouin I of Belgium, Franz Bluecher, Acting Chancellor of Germany, and President Gronchi and Prime minister Segni of Italy, were released on August 24. on October 14, the White House announced interim procedures to assure the Small Business Administration of funds to meet disaster loan requirements in the northeastern States. The messages and the White House announcement were made public at Lowry Air Force Base.]

EL-Dl6-40 (IR)

ALL OF US know, of course, that there has been a very disastrous flood and hurricane in the East. There is much suffering in that region. I received last evening a telegram from E. Roland

Harriman, Chairman of the Red Cross. He addressed me both as President and as Honorary President of the Red Cross. He said--and these are excerpts only:

"In this period of catastrophe among the citizens of the six States affected by floods, I want to assure you that the entire resources of this organization in people, supplies, and money are being fully utilized to bring assistance to all those who are in need. Reports from our chapter in the flood area convince me that the cost of adequately caring for the thousands of families affected will cost many millions of dollars. So that relief work could proceed rapidly I have already made an allotment of $2 million from Red Cross funds and I have appealed to the American people to contribute to a Red Cross disaster fund which will be earmarked entirely for flood sufferers. Since Federal funds released by you are by law primarily for reconstruction of public works rather than direct assistance to individual sufferers, sincerely hope you will urge support of Red Cross appeal which funds will be used entirely to meet human needs.

"At this hour the American Red Cross is operating 107 shelters, housing and feeding 12,000 homeless, and providing clothing to everyone who needs it. We have established headquarters operating around the clock in disaster areas, have more than 400 nurses and 150 physicians who have volunteered for service. Thousands of other volunteers are helping. We estimate over 8000 families will require Red Cross assistance after the emergency is over."

My reaction is, of course, we will pitch in and help. I sincerely hope that before tomorrow night has been reached that Mr. Harriman, Chairman of the Red Cross, will be assured of all the funds he needs to carry out this work with all the help he is getting from the Federal service and from the States affected. The heart of America is not going to stand still while other Americans are in distress and in need of help.

As some of you may know, ever since the beginning of this disaster the Federal Government has been cooperating with the Red Cross in the States affected so as to relieve suffering and to carry on the work of rescue. The Defense Department in particular has been busily engaged in this work and from all States I have had reports of the marvelous work they have done. To assure myself that the Red Cross and Federal Government and the States are cooperating effectively in this regard, leaving no opportunity amiss in order that we may be helpful, I am going to meet Mr. Harriman about eight tomorrow morning in Hartford, Connecticut. To that meeting I have invited the other Governors of the States affected to send representatives or to come in person if their work will allow them to do so just that we may have a little coordinating talk to make sure that everything possible is being done. From there I will proceed to Washington before returning here to Denver Wednesday night.

(209) Remarks Following a Meeting With the Governors of Flood-Stricken States at Bradley Field, Hartford, Connecticut August 23, 1955 [Broadcast over radio. The President refers toVal Peterson, Administrator, Federal Civil Denfense Administration.]

EL-Dl6-59 (RA)

My Fellow Americans:

I have met here with the Governors and Federal officials that you have heard mentioned in this broadcast. Like the rest of you, I read in the papers, saw on the television, and heard on the radio about this great disaster. You can have no conception of what has happened until you come here

and listen to these Governors, what has happened in each State--industries flattened, cities practically paralyzed, communications halted, people out of work, suffering--in certain instances missing members of their families, not knowing where they are. This is a case where the Federal Government, the State government, the county government, the city government will do every possible thing they can. But they operate under laws--laws made by your representatives. And those laws are necessarily limited in the scope of authority they delegate.

Governor Peterson has mentioned how meager are the funds now available to the Federal Government for this specific purpose. I am going to consult immediately with the leaders of Congress. If necessary, I shall call a special session. But what I want to talk about now just for a moment is this: the great value of Red Cross money. Red Cross money is not limited. It goes to people who are in need--to human beings, not just to cleaning roads and rebuilding schools but to people that are hungry, or cold and have no place to go. In my opinion everybody in America within the sound of my voice will sleep better tonight if he turns in everything that he can spare to meet this great disaster that has happened to our fellow Americans. This is a chance where each of us can rise to an emergency and prove that the American people regardless of governments, regardless of the limitations on them can meet an emergency and do it well. I hope you will do it instantly so that by tomorrow night Mr. Roland Harriman here, the Chairman of the Red Cross, will know that he doesn't have to be meager or stingy in the allocations he makes to these areas. In the meantime, I pledge again the Federal Government--and I pledge on the part of all these Governors who made the pledge to me that State governments are going to do everything that is possible to alleviate this situation. We're going into the business of seeing whether we can prevent these floods in the future on a long-range basis, whether we can get insurance through some cooperation between insurance companies and State and Federal governments to prevent the kind of losses that have been suffered by our industries. We're going to try to get work in here to employ these people usefully. We're going to do everything that's possible and won't you do your part right away-quickly? Thank you very much.

(210) Address at the Annual Convention of the American Bar Association, Philadelphia August 24, 1955

EL-DI6-59 (RA)

President Wright, Mr. Chief Justice, Senator Pepper, other distinguished guests, and my friends:

Before I begin the expression of the thoughts I deem appropriate to this occasion, I should like to advert briefly to the tragic incident of our national life that I know is now uppermost in the hearts and minds of all America. I refer, of course, to the tragic disaster on the eastern coast of our country.

We stand in the shadow of the hall in which was written the Constitution of the United States. Implicit in that document is the conviction, the belief, the faith, that Americans would perform by voluntary cooperation those deeds which in other governments, up to that time, had to be performed by direction, by regimentation, by order of Government. Some of those group problems that they thought would be thus solved are those great humanitarian problems that occur when one section of our country suffers the kind of catastrophe that has just been visited upon portions of our eastern coast. Woodrow Wilson said the highest form of democracy is the spontaneous cooperation of a free people. It seems to me now we have one of those most unusual

opportunities to exhibit that spontaneous cooperation.

Frankly I feel we should not wait for the National Red Cross, our agent in such affairs, to appeal to us for help. I believe we should seize the opportunity to give to them--to force upon them--more than they can use, to make certain that disaster is alleviated, that all of those people in those destroyed villages and towns, will understand that America's heart has not forsaken them, that we are proud to help.

Naturally I am honored that once again I am invited to speak before this great representation of the American Bar Association; particularly in this summer of 1955.

This is the first of a series of meetings celebrating the John Marshall Bicentennial. John Marshall was a soldier in the War for Independence, a Congressman, a diplomat of outstanding ability, a Secretary of State.

But his reputation for greatness most firmly rests on his service as Chief Justice of the United States. It was in that office that he established himself, in character, in wisdom, and in his clear insight into the requirements of free government, as a shining example for all later members of his profession.

In his day, the truth about the nature of the Union and the purposes that joined widely separated states into one Republic-about the Constitution and the application of its principles to the problems of the times--was obscured by the fog of sectionalism, selfish interests, and narrow loyalties. Through a generation, he expounded these matters and formulated decisions of such clarity and vigor that we now recognize him as a foremost leader in developing and maintaining the liberties of the people of the United States.

He made of the Constitution a vital, dynamic, deathless charter for free and orderly living in the United States.

Thus his influence has been felt far beyond the confines of the legal fraternity. One result of his work was to create among Americans a deep feeling of trust and respect for the Judiciary. Rarely indeed has that respect been damaged or that trust betrayed by a member of the Judicial branch of our three-sided government.

Americans realize that the independence and integrity and capacity of the Judiciary are vital to our nation's continued existence. For myself, this realization is understandably with me most sharply when it becomes my duty to make a nomination to the Federal Bench.

To the officers and members of the American Bar Association, I express my grateful acknowledgment of the assistance they have rendered, as a public service, in aiding me and my trusted advisers in the review of professional qualifications of individuals under consideration for Federal judicial positions. You have helped secure judges who, I believe, will serve in the tradition of John Marshall.

No other kind will be appointed.

Obviously, a rough equality between the two great political parties should be maintained on the bench. Thus we help assure that the Judiciary will realistically appraise and apply precedent and

principles in the light of current American thinking, and will never become a repository of unbalanced partisan attitudes.

As we turn our minds to the global rather than the primarily national circumstances of our time, I feel that John Marshall's life and his works have even a more profound significance than is to be found in our veneration for the American courts and for his memorable services during the formative years of the Republic.

The central fact of today's life is the existence in the world of two great philosophies of man and of government. They are in contest for the friendship, loyalty, and support of the world's peoples.

On the one side, our nation is ranged with those who seek attainment of human goals through a government of laws administered by men. Those laws are rooted in moral law reflecting a religious faith that man is created in the image of God and that the energy of the free individual is the most dynamic force in human affairs.

On the other side are those who believe--and many of them with evident sincerity--that human goals can be most surely reached by a government of men who rule by decree. Their decrees are rooted in an ideology which ignores the faith that man is a spiritual being; which establishes the all-powerful state as the principal source of advancement and progress.

The case of the several leading nations on both sides is on trial before the bar of world opinion. Each of them claims that it seeks, above all else, an enduring peace in the world. In that claim, all identify themselves with a deep-seated hunger of mankind. But the final judgment on them--and it may be many years in coming--will depend as much on the march of human progress within their own borders, and on their proved capacity to help others advance, as on the tranquillity of their relations with foreign countries.

Mankind wants peace because the fruits of peace are manifold and rich, particularly in this Atomic Age; because war could be the extinction of man's deepest hopes; because atomic war could be race suicide.

The world is astir today with newly awakened peoples. By the hundreds of millions, they march toward opportunity to work and grow and prosper, to demonstrate their self-reliance, to satisfy their aspirations of mind and spirit. Their advance must not and cannot be stopped.

These hundreds of millions help make up the jury which must decide the case between the competing powers of the world.

The system, or group of systems, which most effectively musters its strength in support of peace and demonstrates its ability to advance the well-being, the happiness of the individual, will win their verdict and their loyal friendship.

You of the American Bar Association will play a critical part in the presentation of freedom's case. The many thousands of men and women you represent are, by their professional careers, committed to the search for truth that justice may prevail and human rights may be secured. Thereby, they promote the free world's cause before the bar of world opinion. But let us be clear that, in the global scene, our responsibility as Americans is to present our case as tellingly to the world as John Marshall presented the case for the Constitution to the American public more than

a hundred years ago. In this, your aptitude as lawyers has special application.

In his written works and innumerable decisions, John Marshall proved the adequacy and adaptability of the Constitution to the Nation's needs. He was patient, tireless, understanding, logical, persistent. He was--no matter how trite the expression--a Crusader; his cause, the interpretation of the Constitution to achieve ordered liberty and justice under law.

Now America needs to exercise, in the Crusade for peace, the qualities of John Marshall. Peace and security for all can be established--for the fearful, for the oppressed, for the weak, for the strong. But this can be done only if we stand uncompromisingly for principle, for great issues, with the fervor of Marshall-with the zeal of the Crusader.

We must not think of peace as a static condition in world affairs. That is not true peace, nor in fact can any kind of a peace be preserved that way. Change is the law of life, and unless there is peaceful change, there is bound to be violent change.

Our nation has had domestic tranquillity largely through its capacity to change peacefully. The lone exception was when change, to meet new human concepts, was unduly resisted.

Our Founders would scarcely recognize the nation of today as that which they designed; it has been so greatly changed. But the change has been peaceful and selective; and always conforming to the principles of our founding documents. That has made it possible to conserve the good inherited from the past while adjusting to meet constantly rising goals. In that way we have kept in the front ranks of those who respect human dignity, who produce increasingly and who share fairly the fruits of their labors.

This is the kind of peace that we seek. Our program must be as dynamic, as forward looking, as applicable to the international problems of our times as the Constitution, under John Marshall's interpretations, was made flexible and effective in the promotion of freedom, justice and national strength in America.

That is the spirit in which the American delegation went to Geneva. We asserted then--and we shall always hold--that there can be no true peace which involves acceptance of a status quo in which we find injustice to many nations, repressions of human beings on a gigantic scale, and with constructive effort paralyzed in many areas by fear.

The spirit of Geneva, if it is to provide a healthy atmosphere for the pursuit of peace, if it is to be genuine and not spurious, must inspire all to a correction of injustices, an observance of human rights and an end to subversion organized on a worldwide scale. Whether or not such a spirit as this will thrive through the combined intelligence and understanding of men, or will shrivel in the greed and ruthlessness of some, is for the future to tell. But one thing is certain. This spirit and the goals we seek could never have been achieved by violence or when men and nations confronted each other with hearts filled with fear and hatred.

At Geneva we strove to help establish this spirit.

Geneva spells for America, not stagnation, then, but opportunity--opportunity for our own people and for people everywhere to realize their just aspirations.

Eagerness to avoid war--if we think no deeper than this single desire--can produce outright or implicit agreement that injustices and wrongs of the present shall be perpetuated in the future. We must not participate in any such false agreement. Thereby, we would outrage our own conscience. In the eyes of those who suffer injustice, we would become partners with their oppressors. In the judgment of history, we would have sold out the freedom of men for the pottage of a false peace. Moreover, we would assure future conflict !

The division of Germany cannot be supported by any argument based on boundaries or language or racial origin.

The domination of captive countries cannot longer be justified by any claim that this is needed for purposes of security.

An international political machine, operating within the borders of sovereign nations for their political and ideological subversion, cannot be explained away as a cultural movement.

Very probably, the reason for these and other violations of the rights of men and of nations is a compound of suspicions and fear. That explains. It cannot excuse. In justice to others and to ourselves, we can never accept those wrongs as a part of the peace that we desire and seek.

We must be firm but friendly. We must be tolerant but not complacent. We must be quick to understand another's viewpoint, honestly assumed. But we must never agree to injustice for the weak, for the unfortunate, for the underprivileged, well knowing that if we accept destruction of the principle of justice for all, we cannot longer claim justice for ourselves as a matter of right.

The peace we want--the product of understanding and agreement and law among nations--is an enduring international environment, based on justice and security. It will reflect enlightened self-interest. It will foster the concentration of human energy--individual and organized--for the advancement of human standards in all the areas of mankind's material, intellectual and spiritual life.

Can we achieve that sort of peace? I think we can. At times it may seem hopeless, far beyond human capacity to reach. But has any great accomplishment in history begun with assurance of its success? Our own Republic is a case in point. Through a long generation there was almost a unanimous world conviction that the United States of America was an artificial contrivance that could not long endure.

And the Republic survived its most perilous years--the experimental years--because of dedicated efforts by individuals, not because it had a built-in guarantee of success or a path free from obstacles.

Our case for peace, based on justice, is as sound as was John Marshall's for the Constitution and the Union. And it will be as successful--if we present it before the bar of world opinion with the same courage and dedicated conviction that he brought to his mission.

In our communities we can, each according to his capacity, promote comprehension of what this Republic must be--in strength, in understanding, in dedication to principle--if it is to fulfill its role of leadership for peace.

In the search for justice, we can make our system an ever more glorious example of an orderly government devoted to the preservation of human freedom and man's individual opportunities and responsibilities.

No matter how vigorously we propose and uphold our individual views in domestic problems, we can present abroad a united front in all that concerns the freedom and security of the Republic, its dedication to a just and prosperous peace.

Above all, conscious of the towering achievements manifest in the Republic's history under the Constitution, assured that no human problem is beyond solution given the will, the perseverance and the strength--each of us can help arouse in America a renewed and flaming dedication to justice and liberty, prosperity and peace among men.

So acting, we shall prove ourselves--lawyers and laymen alike--worthy heirs to the example and spirit of John Marshall. Like him in his great mission, we shall succeed.

(212) Statement by the President: Labor Day

September 2, 1955 aired September 5, 1955

EL-Dl6-40 (IR)

THIS DAY is set aside, in our country, for America to salute the men and women who with their heads, hands and hearts produce the wealth of the Nation.

All of us are proud that the working men and women of our land labor in freedom and dignity, with efficiency and enthusiasm, at the jobs of their choice, in whatever community they wish, and receive fair compensation for their efforts.

We can also be proud that the individual human beings who make up this great labor force come from all races, all religions, and all national origins. They work on farms, in factories, in stores, in mines and in offices. They work on land and on sea and in the air.

In honoring the Nation's workers today, we reaffirm our devotion to the Nation itself--which over the years and decades, American workmen have built.

NOTE: This statement was released at Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colo.

(218) Message Opening the United Community Campaigns of America July 27, 1955 aired October 2, 1955

[Recorded before the President's hospitalization, was broadcast over radio and television at 7:55pm.]

EL-DI6-39 (IR)

My Fellow Citizens:

My talk has to do with a strictly domestic matter. Between now and Thanksgiving Day the United Community Campaigns of America will be held. In one town the campaign may be called the United Community Chest; in another, the United Fund or the United Crusade. The names

differ, but the one word and the one purpose that all have in common is "united."

The campaigns are united in support of some twenty-one thousand voluntary health, welfare and youth agencies--including the USO, and in many cities, the Red Cross and national causes such as Heart, Cancer and Crippled Children. They ask your help, not through twenty-one thousand separate competitive appeals, but through one annual appeal in each city. Together they constitute the biggest single voluntary cause in our nation.

In addition to the many health services they support, these United Community agencies help social scientists study the cause and cure of family break-downs that wreck homes, hurt children, waste life. They work to prevent and thus to end the plague of juvenile delinquency--and adult delinquency too, may I add. And they constantly wage war against the virus of prejudice, bigotry and inhumanity. They are doing their job the united way because man is a united being. Such an appeal calls for a united response.

So, when the volunteer campaigner knocks at our doors and at our hearts, I urge that we all unite to give him a neighborly welcome.

Thank you very much.

(235) Remarks on Leaving Denver, Colorado November 11, 1955

[The President spoke at the airport, Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado at 8:44am. In his remarks the President referred to Maj. Gen. Martin E. Griffin, Commanding General of Fitzsimons Army Hospital, and Maj. Gen. John T. Sprague, Commander of Lowry Air Force Base.]

EL-Dl6-59 (RA)

My friends:

Again it is time for Mrs. Eisenhower and me to say goodbye to Denver after a summer's stay. This time we leave under somewhat unusual circumstances. As you know, I have spent some time in the hospital. Such a time is not wholly a loss.

Misfortune, and particularly the misfortune of illness, brings to all of us an understanding of how good people are.

To General Griffin, the staff at Fitzsimons, the medical staff, the nurses, the clinical technicians, the enlisted men--all of the people that even clean out the hospital: my very grateful thanks, because they have done so much, not only to take care of me, but to make my stay as pleasant as possible. They are devoted people.

In the same way, here at this Post, General Sprague and his staff have taken on an additional and extra load, and have done it cheerfully and in a way to earn my eternal gratitude.

Then, Mrs. Eisenhower and I have both been touched by the volume of messages that have come in--telegrams and letters and flowers and gifts. And finally we have been especially grateful. for the knowledge that over this country and over the world friends have sent up their prayers for a sick person.

So I leave with my heart unusually filled with gratefulness, to Denver, to the people here, to the locality--in fact to everyone who has been so kind.

And I hope that those people who have sent in messages--and Mrs. Eisenhower has not been able to reach them all; she did her best--that they will know, through this little talk, that we are eternally thankful to them.

Goodbye and good luck.

(236) Remarks on Arrival at the Washington National Airport November 11, 1955

[The President spoke at 4:03pm. The Vice President presented remarks of welcome.]

EL-DI6-59 (RA)

President Hoover, Mr. Vice President, my very dear friends:

I am deeply honored that so many of you should come down to welcome Mrs. Eisenhower and me back to Washington. It has been a little longer stay than we had planned, but the circumstances you will understand.

I am happy that the doctors have given me at least a parole if not a pardon, and I expect to be back at my accustomed duties, although they say I must ease my way into them and not bulldoze my way into them.

To each of you who have come down, of course, we would like to speak personally and thank you for the honor you have done us.

That is impossible, and so, possibly in just saying thank you, we are grateful, you will understand what we would like to do and you will let the wish take the place of the deed. Thank you very much.

(237) Remarks Upon Arrival in Lincoln Square, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania November 14, 1955

[The President spoke at 1pm. His opening words "Mr. Burgess, Mrs. Weaver, Patty" referred to William G. Weaver, Burgess of Gettysburg, Mrs. Weaver, and their daughter, Patricia.]

EL-Dl6-40 (IR)

Mr. Burgess, Mrs. Weaver, Patty, and my future permanent neighbors, I hope:

Of course, Mrs. Eisenhower and I feel deeply honored that you should turn out today to welcome us to this area where we expect to make our home and which has been so long a part of the Eisenhower family's life.

In fact, I think that my wife decided back in 1918, before many of you were born, that this was going to be our home upon retirement, but she did not give me her decision until later than that.

In any event, I am just as delighted as she that you are the people who are going to be our neighbors, God willing.

And to each of you who has come out this morning, to each of the school children who along the way have waved these little flags or his hand, or called a greeting, our very deep thanks. We are truly grateful to all of you. Goodbye.

(242) Remarks for the White House Conference on Education November 23, 1955 aired November 28, 1955

[On November 23, the President drove from his farm to Gettysburg College where his remarks were recorded on film and tape for the Conference. The remarks were released at Gettysburg on the 28th.]

EL-Dl6-40 (IR)

IT IS indeed an honor to have this opportunity to address, even by indirect method, you men and women of the White House Conference on Education. You come from every one of our States and our Territories. By being here you are focusing attention on a grave national problem. That problem is the losing race between the number of classrooms and qualified teachers we have on the one hand, and, on the other, the increasing population of school age.

Ten years ago the guns were stilled and the war was ended. Very naturally, our country, like all others, found itself in a state of great confusion. Many problems were lost sight of as we turned our attention to preserving the peace, to establishing international organizations for that purpose. We took care of many other problems that were directly incidental to the war.

Much has happened in those ten years. We have seen the bright hopes for peace not fully fulfilled certainly, but we have seen our Nation grow stronger economically, militarily, stronger intellectually and, we believe, spiritually.

Through this period confusion has gradually been disappearing. We have had a chance to clarify our thinking and to look at most of our national problems with a good hard look.

One of the factors that has come forcibly to our attention is that in the last ten years our population has increased by 26 million souls. During that great increase a similar increase in the number of schoolrooms and qualified teachers available for teaching our young has not come about. So we are faced today with the grave problem of providing a good education for American youth.

In such a problem as this we know, of course, that many facilities are lacking--many things have to be done. There are, likewise, many conflicting opinions as to how to provide these things. This is only natural. In such a problem that is so nationwide in scope, everybody has opinions and is perfectly ready to express them, and not all of these opinions ever agree in a democracy. But there are two points, I think, on which we all agree.

The first thing is that the education of our young should be free. It should be under the control of the family and the locality. It should not be controlled by any central authority. We know that

education, centrally controlled, finally would lead to a kind of control in other fields which we don't want and will never have. So we are dedicated to the proposition that the responsibility for educating our young is primarily local.

At the same time we know that everybody must have a good education if they are properly to discharge their functions as citizens of America.

And so we come to the hear of this whole problem. We want good facilities on the one hand, and we know that there are many areas in which people cannot afford to build the schools, to provide the facilities that the populations of that particular area need.

If we depend too much on outside help, too much on the Federal Government, we will lose independence and initiative. But if the Federal Government doesn't step in with leadership and with providing credit and money where necessary, there will be a lack of schools in certain important areas. And this cannot be allowed.

So this is a problem again where the private citizen, the locality, the State and the Federal Government all have a function to perform, all have a responsibility to meet--always in conformity with those two basic truths that education must be free and it must be good.

There are no easy solutions, and I don't expect this Conference to find any easy solutions. But I do know this: when sensible Americans--men and women--sit down together to discuss a problem in the hope of achieving a solution that is good for the whole Nation, something sensible comes out. We don't have crackpot ideas. We don't have doctrinaire opinions or solutions.

So we want a solution that is good for all, and all of us want to help in the proper way.

This Conference of yours, of course, has been preceded by State and community conferences all over the Nation. Some of you participated in them. Much good has come out of it. You, by meeting here, continue the work of those conferences. You begin to crystallize the solutions that they have proposed and suggested and will try to bring them together so that the good of the whole Nation may be met.

You have an arduous schedule ahead of you. But I particularly like the idea I have heard that you are going to break yourselves up into small groups so that every phase and facet of this problem will be thoroughly discussed among you and so that nothing will be glossed over, nothing will be handled in generalities. We will get down to specific things.

So all I can say further is: I am deeply grateful to each of you for participating in this Conference, for helping in the solution of this problem. I am grateful to all of those in the community and State conferences that took place ahead of this one. I am perfectly certain that I speak for every American in expressing their thanks, along with my own, as you take up this task.

(245) Telephone Broadcast to the.AFL-CIO Merger Meeting in New York City December 5, 1955

[The President spoke at 2:30pm from Gettysburg. The meeting was held in the 71st Regimental Armory in New York City. The President's opening words "Mr. Meany, Mr.Schnitzler" referred to George Meany and William F. Schnitzler, President and Secretary Treasurer, respectively, of the AFL-CIO. The President's remarks were released at Gettysburg.]

EL-Dl6-40 (IR)

Mr. Meany, Mr. Schnitzler, members of the Executive Council, Delegates to this Convention and ladies and gentlemen of the AFL-CIO everywhere in America:

You of organized labor and those who have gone before you in the union movement have helped make a unique contribution to the general welfare of the Republic--the development of the American philosophy of labor. This philosophy, if adopted globally, could bring about a world, prosperous, at peace, sharing the fruits of the earth with justice to all men. It would raise to freedom and prosperity hundreds of millions of men and women--and their children--who toil in slavery behind the Curtain.

One principle of this philosophy is: the ultimate values of mankind are spiritual; these values include liberty, human dignity, opportunity and equal rights and justice.

Workers want recognition as human beings and as individuals-before everything else. They want a job that gives them a feeling of satisfaction and self-expression. Good wages, respectable working conditions, reasonable hours, protection of status and security; these constitute the necessary foundations on which you build to reach your higher aims.

Moreover, we cannot be satisfied with welfare in the aggregate; if any group or section of citizens is denied its fair place in the common prosperity, all others among us are thereby endangered.

The second principle of this American labor philosophy is this: the economic interest of employer and employee is a mutual prosperity.

Their economic future is inseparable. Together they must advance in mutual respect, in mutual understanding, toward mutual prosperity. Of course, there will be contest over the sharing of the benefits of production; and so we have the right to strike and to argue all night, when necessary, in collective bargaining sessions. But in a deeper sense, this surface struggle is subordinate to the overwhelming common interest in greater production and a better life for all to share.

The American worker strives for betterment not by destroying his employer and his employer's business, but by understanding his employer's problems of competition, prices, markets. And the American employer can never forget that, since mass production assumes a mass market, good wages and progressive employment practices for his employee are good business.

The Class Struggle Doctrine of Marx was the invention of a lonely refugee scribbling in a dark recess of the British Museum. He abhorred and detested the middle class. He did not foresee that, in America, labor, respected and prosperous, would constitute--with the farmer and businessman--his hated middle class. But our second principle--that mutual interest of employer and employee--is the natural outgrowth of teamwork for progress, characteristic of the American

economy where the barriers of class do not exist.

The third principle is this: labor relations will be managed best when worked out in honest negotiation between employers and unions, without Government's unwarranted interference.

This principle requires maturity in the private handling of labor matters within a framework of law, for the protection of the public interest and the rights of both labor and management. The splendid record of labor peace and unparalleled prosperity during the last 3 years demonstrates our industrial maturity.

Some of the most difficult and unprecedented negotiations in the history of collective bargaining took place during this period, against the backdrop of non-interference by Government except only to protect the public interest, in the rare cases of genuine national emergency. This third principle, relying as it does on collective bargaining, assumes that labor organizations and management will both observe the highest standards of integrity, responsibility, and concern for the national welfare.

You are more than union members bound together by a common goal of better wages, better working conditions, and protection of your security. You are American citizens.

The roads you travel, the schools your children attend, the taxes you pay, the standards of integrity in Government, the conduct of the public business is your business as Americans. And while all of you, as to the public business, have a common goal--a stronger and better America--your views as to the best means of reaching that goal vary widely, just as they do in any other group of American citizens.

So in your new national organization, as well as in your many constituent organizations, you have a great opportunity of making your meetings the world's most effective exhibit of democratic processes. In those meetings the rights of minorities holding differing social, economic, and political views must be scrupulously protected and their views accurately reflected. In this way, as American citizens you will help the Republic correct the faulty, fortify the good, build stoutly for the future, and reinforce the most cherished freedoms of each individual citizen.

This country has long understood that by helping other peoples to a better understanding and practice of representative government, we strengthen both them and ourselves. The same truth applies to the economic field. We strengthen other peoples and ourselves when we help them to understand the workings of a free economy, to improve their own standards of living, and to join with us in world trade that serves to unite us all.

In the world struggle, some of the finest weapons for all Americans are these simple tenets of free labor. They are again: mart is created in the Divine image and has spiritual aspirations that transcend the material; second, the real interests of employers and employees are mutual; third, unions and employers can and should work out their own destinies. As we preach and practice that message without cease, we will wage a triumphant crusade for prosperity, freedom, and peace among men.

To close, it is fitting that we let our hearts be filled with the earnest prayer that, with the help of a kind Providence, the world may be led out of bitterness and materialism and force into a new era

of harmony and spiritual growth and self-realization for all men. Thank you very much.

(250) Remarks Broadcast for the Pageant of Peace Ceremonies in Washington December 18, 1955

[The President spoke at 5:10pm over radio and television from Gettysburg College just before lighting, by remote control, the National Community Christmas Tree in Washington.]

EL-Dl6-60 (RA)

My fellow Americans at home and across the seas, my fellow men and women of every nation:

For hundreds of millions of us, Christmas symbolizes our deepest aspirations for peace and for goodwill among men.

For me, this particular Christmas has a very special meaning, and has brought to me, really, new understandings of people.

During the past three months my family and I have received literally thousands--tens of thousands of messages. Each of these has borne a sentence of good wishes and goodwill for health and happiness to us both. It has been heartwarming evidence that human understanding and human sympathy can surmount every obstacle--even those obstacles that some governments sometimes seem to raise in the attempt to divide us.

Now the free world is just coming to the close of a very significant year, one in which we have worked hard and sometimes effectively for peace. Now the facts of today, of course, do not measure up to the high hopes of the free world, the hopes by which we have lived and which we have long entertained. But this Christmas is, nevertheless, brighter in its background and its promise for the future than any we have known in recent years. I think it is even better than last year, and you will remember that Christmas was the first one in many years that was not marred by the tragic incidents of war.

Now peace is the right of every human being. It is hungered for by all of the peoples of the earth. So we can be sure that tonight in the fullness of our hearts and in the spirit of the season, that as we utter a simple prayer for peace we will be joined by the multitudes of the earth.

Those multitudes will include rulers as well as the humblest citizens of lands; the great and the meek; the proud and the poor; the successful and the failures; the dispirited and the hopefuls.

Now each of those prayers will of course differ according to the characteristics and the personality of the individual uttering it, but running through every single one of those prayers will be a thought something of this kind:

May each of us strive to do our best to bring about better understanding in the world. And may the infinite peace from above live with us and be ours forever, and may we live in the confident hope that it will come.

And so it is tonight in that hope, which must never die from the earth, which we must cling to and cherish and nurture and work for, that I light the National Community Christmas Tree at the

Pageant of Peace in Washington.

To each of you--wherever you may be--from Mrs. Eisenhower and me: a very Merry Christmas!

End of document